

1-1-2003

## Harassment prevention training in higher education: educating or silencing?

Julie Lynn Snyder-Yuly  
*Iowa State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd>

---

### Recommended Citation

Snyder-Yuly, Julie Lynn, "Harassment prevention training in higher education: educating or silencing?" (2003). *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 20047.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/20047>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Retrospective Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

**Harassment prevention training in higher education:  
Educating or silencing?**

by

Julie Lynn Snyder-Yuly

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major: Interdisciplinary Graduate Studies

Program of Study Committee:  
Tracey Owens Patton (Major Professor)  
Sharon Bird  
Dennis Field

Iowa State University

Ames, IA

2003

Graduate College  
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the master's thesis of

Julie Lynn Snyder-Yuly

has met the thesis requirements of Iowa State University

Signatures have been redacted for privacy

## **DEDICATION**

This thesis is dedicated to Weetie and the boys.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Definitions of Harassment	4
<i>Sexual Harassment</i>	4
<i>Racial/Ethnic Harassment</i>	9
Who is affected by Harassment?	12
<i>Sexual Harassment</i>	13
<i>Racial/Ethnic Harassment</i>	17
Profile of a Harasser	23
<i>Harassment and Power</i>	23
<i>Sexual Harasser</i>	26
<i>Racial/Ethnic Harasser</i>	30
Effects of Harassment	33
<i>Identity and Identity Formation</i>	33
<i>Effects on the Individual</i>	35
<i>Effects on the Institution</i>	37
Creating a Policy	47
Harassment Prevention Education and Training	50

<i>Sexual Harassment</i>	51
<i>Racial/Ethnic Harassment</i>	53
<i>Creating a Training Program</i>	55
<i>Web-based Training</i>	59
<i>Benefits of Web-based Training</i>	62
<i>Drawbacks of Web-based Training</i>	63
Summary of Literature Review	65
Statement of Purpose	66
Theoretical Assumptions	67
Justification of the Study	73
Research Questions	74
3. METHODOLOGY	75
Methodological Considerations	75
Setting	76
<i>Demographics and Classification Systems</i>	76
<i>Harassment Prevention Training</i>	80
Selection and Description of Participants	82
Method	85
<i>Data Collection</i>	85
<i>Data Analysis</i>	85
Summary	86
4. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	88

Research Question 1	88
Group Training	88
<i>Participants</i>	88
<i>Benefits</i>	89
<i>Drawbacks</i>	91
<i>Ways to Improve</i>	93
On-line Training	95
<i>Benefits</i>	95
<i>Drawbacks</i>	97
<i>Ways to Improve</i>	98
Research Question 2	99
<i>Campus Climate</i>	99
<i>Harassment Statistics</i>	100
<i>What Happens on Campus</i>	102
<i>Follow-up and Assessment</i>	104
Summary	106
5. DISCUSSION	108
Research Question 1	109
<i>Experiences and Perceptions</i>	110
<i>Silencing Women and Minorities</i>	115
Research Question 2	118
<i>Extrafunctional Abilities</i>	119

<i>Becoming Aware of our Culture</i>	120
<i>Political Consciousness or Status Quo?</i>	125
Summary	128
6. CONCLUSION	130
Implications	130
Limitations of the Study	131
Suggestions for Future Research	132
Conclusion	133
APPENDIX A.    INVITATION LETTER	136
APPENDIX B.    CONSENT FORM	137
APPENDIX C.    INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	138
REFERENCES CITED	140



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my major professor, my mentor, and my friend, Dr. Tracey Owens Patton, who encouraged me and guided me through my master's program and thesis. I am also very grateful to the members of my committee, Dr. Sharon Bird and Dr. Dennis Field, both of whom offered helpful comments, suggestions, and support on this project.

I want to thank my family, my husband Farin, Dad and Marilyn, Mom and Ed, and Melissa and Iain for all their love, support, and encouragement. Also, I would like to thank Dawn and Jennifer for their patience, understanding, and enduring friendship throughout this project.

Special thanks to my co-worker and friend, Peggy Talbert, who took time away from her schedule to help me edit this project and my boss and friend, Dianne Bystrom, who supported me in numerous ways to enable me to complete my degree.

I also want to thank the College of Education, the Human Resources Office, the Department of Public Safety, and the University Committee on Women for providing me with assistance and information to help me complete this project.

Finally, a special thank you to those who were willing to take time out of their schedules to let me interview them. Your time and your thoughts were invaluable to this project.

## **ABSTRACT**

It is increasingly evident that sexual, racial, and ethnic harassment continues to impact college campuses around the nation. An abundance of research focuses on harassment itself; this thesis focuses on harassment prevention training in higher education, specifically, on the difference between group and on-line training methods at Iowa State University.

Issues of convenience, time, and numbers of people who can be reached have led many institutions to implement on-line training programs in lieu of or in addition to their traditional group training methods. Research was conducted to investigate the difference between group and on-line harassment prevention training in terms of how the training is conducted, who participates in the training sessions, and how harassment training was implemented at Iowa State University. The research focused on the relationship between power and harassment prevention training methods, with the overall questions “Do harassment prevention training methods educate or silence?”

## 1.

**INTRODUCTION**

“In 1960 higher education in the United States was largely the domain of white male students and faculty” (Morris and Parker, 1996, p. 1). Of almost five million college students in 1964, slightly over one third were women and minorities (p. 1). By 1992, women made up the majority of students (55%) and minorities represented 20% of the 14.5 million students (p. 1). As colleges and universities continue to become more diverse, it is not surprising that problems concerning racial and sexual harassment continue to plague campuses. Harassment is about power, and historically Whites and men have had the power. Harassers, whether male, female, faculty, or student, utilize their perceived power to maintain or acquire more power.

Perceptions and stereotypes often create self-fulfilling prophecies. Perceptions and stereotypes of women and minorities increase their vulnerability to harassment (DeFour, 1996; Paludi, 1996; and Sandler and Shoop, 1996). It is important to realize that when people are perceived and stereotyped in a certain way, they often start to believe in and act out these perceptions. When campuses fail to educate their faculty, staff, and students, and seemingly tolerate harassing behavior, they are essentially saying that harassment is acceptable. Thus, by failing to educate faculty, staff, and students, colleges and universities may unknowingly be accepting these stereotypes and perceptions as norms.

Hall (1993) writes the following:

In academia, the question of who decides what issues count is even more problematic given a situation which work by and about marginalized groups has not been read or understood by the dominant majority, and is made worse by the lack of female and

colored players on the “level playing field.” We do not come to the “dialogue” from positions of equality - the dynamics of gender, race, and class skew how others perceived the validity of speakers and ideas. In institutional settings where tenure and real administrative power are overwhelmingly concentrated in the hands of white men, who will educate the educators? (p. 163-164)

The purpose of this research is to examine Iowa State University’s harassment prevention training programs. It will be important to have an understanding of definitions of harassment, the effects of harassment, policies on harassment, and how harassment policies and prevention training are presented to the intended audience. Information will be presented regarding harassment issues relevant to Iowa State University, including statistical information on the campus, surveys that have been conducted relative to harassment issues, and policies and procedures for dealing with harassment.

This research focuses on the faculty, staff, and students who have participated in one of Iowa State University’s harassment prevention training programs and concentrates on learning from their perspective about their training experience. An interview process was used to learn how participants found out about the training, the reasons for participating in a particular training program, the benefits and drawbacks of the training program, and how they view Iowa State University’s commitment to harassment issues.

Although the total number of cases of harassment on campus is not known, the fact that harassment on campus continues to happen must be addressed. This study addresses the issues of how harassment prevention training is conducted on a campus setting, what the differences are between the two University’s types of training programs, and what has been

the impact of training on campus. This research will examine how issues of race, gender, and positional status lead to choices in the type of training taken and the individual perceptions and opinions of the training programs. Issues of race, gender, and power are significant when looking at harassment and harassment prevention. Just as harassment is an issue of power, it is also an issue of communication. The perpetrators of harassment have power over their victims and they also control the communication. Often the victim is unable to address the harasser or fears reporting the incidence. If this is the case, she/he essentially loses her/his voice. One significant factor of this research is to determine how power and communication are affected by harassment prevention training. The overall question is, "Are the methods of training designed to educate the campus or do they serve to silence those not in power?"

## 2.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

For the purpose of this thesis, background information and research on sexual and racial/ethnic harassment specifically related to higher education, as well as literature on training and development programs is presented. While there is substantial research specifically dealing with sexual harassment, much of the information about racial harassment is found in literature on racism, discrimination, and prejudice. Often, terms such as prejudice, racism, institutional or attitudinal racism are used in describing harassment, harassing behaviors, or institutional behaviors leading to harassment and discrimination of people of varying race and ethnic backgrounds. Because of this, these terms may be used in place of harassment throughout the literature review.

This chapter provides a review of the literature related to harassment and harassment prevention training. This review highlights six topics related to harassment in higher education. These topics include the definitions of harassment, who is affected by harassment, the profile of a harasser, the effects of harassment, creating a policy, and harassment prevention education and training. These six topics will serve as the major divisions for this chapter.

**Definitions of Harassment***Sexual Harassment*

There are several issues that must be considered prior to educating a campus about harassment and harassment prevention. Regarding issues of harassment, there are multiple problems confronting the academy. One of the first problems is the ambiguity in the

definition of harassment (Dziech and Hawkins, 1998; Fitzgerald, 1996a; and Sandler and Shoop, 1996). While one can easily point out certain overt acts of harassment; quid pro quo, sexual bribery, physical touching, and derogatory language used to refer to individuals based on gender or race, other issues are much more difficult to define. Exactly what constitutes a hostile environment, what does offensive mean, and is the intimidating behavior directed at one particular individual or is this a personality issue? What one person defines as hostile, may have the completely opposite effect on another (Dziech and Hawkins, 1998).

An additional concern is the issue of free speech or expression. How does the university allow free speech but prevent harassment? The university must strike a balance between free speech for students and faculty and the right of a person to pursue educational or work objectives without harassment (Dziech and Hawkins, 1998, p. 18). Additionally, the university not only has to protect its faculty, staff, and students, but it also has to protect itself from harassment claims and/or other legal issues arising from actions relating to these claims.

One of the most consistent problems in the literature on sexual harassment is the absence of a widely agreed upon definition. This affects not only the literature and research, but also the policies that are established on college campuses. According to the Iowa State University,

Sexual harassment, in its legal definition, includes unwelcome sexual advances, requests to engage in sexual conduct, and other physical and expressive behavior of a sexual nature where (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or education; (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used, or threatened or

suggested to be used, as the basis for academic employment decisions affecting the individual; or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's academic or professional performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or demeaning employment or academic environment.

Determination as to whether the alleged conduct constitutes sexual harassment should take into consideration the totality of the circumstances, including the context in which the alleged incidents occurred (ISU Affirmative Action Office, 2001).

Although there is no universally accepted definition of sexual harassment, a sound definition should set the policy, inform and educate the community, affirm that sexual harassment is sex discrimination, that it is illegal and damaging to the academic community, that it can encompass a broad range of behaviors, and that it may occur as single, ongoing, or repeated incidents (Dziech & Weiner, 1990).

Fitzgerald (1996a) analyzes the legal and institutional definitions of sexual harassment in higher education, as well as some of the factors that prevent clear-cut definitions. The Equal Employment guidelines suggest two general types of sexual harassment: quid pro quo and the creation of hostile environment. Quid pro quo is when an attempt is made to coerce an individual into sexual cooperation by use of rewards or punishments. Creation of a hostile environment consists of offensive, degrading, or intimidating behavior, which are not used as a sexual stimulant. Fitzgerald identified another related but distinct type of harassment – gender harassment. Gender harassment is made up of sexist or stereotyped assumptions made about women as a group in a learning environment by persons in positions of authority.



Sandler and Shoop (1996) offer three major characteristics of sexual harassment: unwanted or unwelcome behavior, sexist or gender-related behavior, and behavior in the context of power. The victim defines unwanted or unwelcome behavior. Behavior that is unwelcome by the recipient may be considered sexual harassment; however, another recipient may welcome this same behavior. Verbal, nonverbal, and physical behavior that has a sexual or gender related tone might also be considered harassment. Because sexual harassment has more to do with power and less to do with sex, people with less power can be easily intimidated by those with power.

Sandler and Shoop (1996) offer three generalized forms of sexual harassment: quid pro quo, hostile environment, and sexual favoritism. Sandler and Shoop identify favoritism as a form of sexual harassment in which a forced or unwanted sexual relationship leads to a promotion or in which widespread favoritism occurs for employees because they are providing sexual favors or participating in sexed or gendered conversations or activities. According to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, these activities constitute a hostile environment.

Although sexual harassment is defined by the law and by the institution, many remain uncertain about which actions and activities constitute sexual harassment. According to Fitzgerald (1996a), perceptions are influenced by cultural stereotypes about behavior, the nature of romantic relations, gender, and sexuality. Fitzgerald also points out that institutional definitions often state that the behavior must be unwanted and that it must substantially interfere with environment or performance. This assumes that some of these behaviors are wanted and that individuals must live with an acceptable level of interference. Another

problem she addresses is that university definitions fail to address the idea of consensual sexual relationships, suggesting a certain amount of academic discomfort in interfering with the “private arena.” Shoop and Sandler (1996) stress the problems with consensual relationships, pointing to issues such as conflict of interest, “serial” harassers, exploitation, and abuse during and after a relationship.

In a study by Shepela and Levesque (1998), they found that more students experienced sexual harassing behavior than would label it as such. The authors also found that women are more likely than men to label behaviors as sexual harassment. Luthar and Pastille (2000) point out that the literature suggests that males are more comfortable than females with social-sexual behaviors in the workplace, have a different perception of what constitutes harassment, and may be flattered by sexual overtures. In Luthar and Pastille’s theoretical research, a suggestion is made that age, education, marital status, and minority status of a subordinate may be correlated to perceptions of sexual harassment.

In keeping with the ideas of perception, Corr and Jackson’s (2001) research found that gender and status/liking of the protagonist affected a person’s perception of harassment. The results of Corr and Jackson’s study were that unwanted sexual attention and gender harassment rate more seriously when committed by a disliked boss than by a liked boss. This study also found that the status of the protagonist was important. Harassment by a subordinate or boss was rated to be more serious than harassment by a colleague.

Definitions and perceptions of harassment play an important role in developing sexual harassment policies on campus. Many campuses have developed sexual harassment policies to avoid litigation, rather than for purposes of education. Because a clear-cut definition is

lacking, colleges and universities must find ways of educating their faculty, staff, and students about the causes and effects of sexual harassment. Without this education, harassing behaviors will not only continue, but also segregate the campus by drawing clear lines as to who has the power and who does not. It should be clear that developing a policy is different than educating individuals.

### *Racial/Ethnic Harassment*

A widely agreed upon definition for racial/ethnic harassment is also absent. Again, this affects the policies that are established on college campuses. According to the Iowa State University,

Racial/ethnic harassment is any non-consenting conduct based upon race, ethnicity, or national origin that creates a hostile work or educational environment. Racial or ethnic harassment may include, but is not limited to, threats, physical contact, pranks, vandalism, or verbal, graphic or written conduct directed at an individual or individuals because of their race or national origin. Even if actions are not directed at specific persons, a hostile environment is created when the conduct is sufficiently severe, pervasive, or persistent so as to reasonably interfere with or limit the ability of an individual to work, study, or otherwise participate in activities of the university.

(ISU Affirmative Action Office, 2001)

Racial/ethnic harassment takes on many forms: language and words, signs and symbols, and actions. The most notable type of racial harassment is creating a hostile work environment. According to Deadrick, McAfee, and Champagne (1996), “hostile environment harassment occurs when verbal or physical conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably

interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment, whether or not such conduct is directly linked to economic job benefits." (p. 67)

Racial/ethnic harassment is tied in directly with racism. According to de la Luz Reyes and Halcon (2000), racial acts may also be overt or covert. Overt acts are open and up-front, for example, the use of terms like, "nigger" or symbols such as a swastika. On the other hand, covert acts, which are the most pervasive, are elusive.

Five acts of covert racism are identified by de la Luz Reyes and Halcon (2000). The first is tokenism. Tokenism occurs when a small number of individuals belonging to minority groups are appointed to positions of importance. Often, the only significance of these positions is in the title. Individuals in these situations may indeed find themselves in a hostile environment in the sense they have little authority for their position and are often passed over for promotions.

The second act identified by these authors is the typecasting syndrome, which is related to tokenism. The typecasting syndrome is the assumption that only minorities can or should occupy minority related positions (de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, 2000). Positions such as directors of African American, American Indian, and Asian Studies; faculty in foreign languages; directors of student organizations; and positions in minority services are expected to be held by minorities. Typecasting is another way of preventing minorities from becoming integrated into the university

The third act of covert racism is the "one-minority-per-pot syndrome." de la Luz Reyes and Halcon (2000) define this as the quota system which prevents the hiring of more

than one minority member per department. This stems from the belief that minorities are not as qualified as Whites. The stereotypical belief that minorities are not as intelligent as Whites helps perpetuate the dominant group's perception of others as inferior. Attribution of cultural stereotypes, often leads to the loss of individual identity (Lindsley, 1998, p. 202).

Not only does the one-minority-per-pot syndrome assume that minorities are not as intelligent as Whites, it also makes the assumption that the caliber of faculty will be lessened. In many cases, Affirmative Action programs are blamed for requiring departments to hire minorities instead of "fully qualified" candidates. Because of this belief, many minority candidates are required to provide additional documentation of their success. "Since it is usually minorities who are singled out to provide additional documentation, and the requests are usually made after they have become top candidates, there is adequate groundwork for suspecting covert racism is at work," explain de la Luz Reyes and Halcon (2000, p. 89).

The fourth act of covert racism identified by de la Luz Reyes and Halcon (2000), explains the brown-on-brown research taboo. Whites often disapprove of research where a minority researches minority issues or cultures and dismiss it as self-serving (p. 89). Woods (2001) explains that often research on Black women is marginalized, especially if it is conducted by black women. Black women have even been cautioned "to de-emphasize the racial and or gendered aspects of their research" (Woods, 2001, p.113). This results in what Collins (1998) refers to as "silencing." Although Collins is referring to the silencing of Black women, the concept may apply to all minority groups.

The hairsplitting concept is de la Luz Reyes and Halcon's (2000) fifth category of covert racism. "Hairsplitting occurs when "trivial technicalities" and "subjective judgment

calls” prevent minorities from getting jobs or being promoted (p. 90). When the dominant culture decides what is best for the job and the individual, minorities are denied the benefits of their education. “Hairsplitting” seeks to justify employing Whites over minorities on the basis of minor technicalities. The department claims it wants to hire the “best qualified candidate,” not another minority. All of these overt and covert forms of racism have serious psychological effects on the individuals involved; as well as on the academic community and society as a whole.

### **Who is Affected by Harassment?**

Another factor that the institution must deal with is statistical ambiguity (Dziech and Hawkins, 1998). The question, “how big of a problem is harassment?” has no definite answer. Various studies estimate statistics of unreported incidences of harassment ranging from less than 10% to over 90%. The rates of actual reported cases of harassment are traditionally very low. According to Dziech and Hawkins, there are approximately 4.3 formal sexual harassment complaints a year per each academic institution (p. 23). The only constant they report is that the overwhelming majority of sexual harassers are men. Unfortunately, there are no studies that provide information on the percent of faculty, staff, or students who engage in harassment (p. 23).

The issue of reporting sexual/racial/ethnic harassment is another major concern as the extent of harassment within the university can only be known if the victims or witnesses will report the instances to the appropriate authorities. However, even if these instances are reported, it is still up to the victim to decide what actions they want the university to take. There are many reasons individuals do not report incidences of harassment: fear of

retaliation, fear of the system, unsure if the behavior experienced was harassment, fear of disbelief, powerlessness, and an array of other reasons known only to the victim.

Along with this is the issue of privacy (Dziech and Hawkins, 1998). Often those who experience harassment are fearful of having their identity exposed. These individuals do not want to face others who may disbelieve them and cause them more problems. Fear of being identified as an accuser is a huge reason why individuals do not report harassment. On the other hand, if someone is accused, is it right to publicize the accuser's or the accused's name until they are proven guilty? Once people hear about a potential incident of harassment, they immediately want to know who is involved. If the university does not immediately respond to this question, it leads to the assumption that something significant is happening. This leads to an unfortunate bind of how much and what to communicate to the public. With all of the secrecy surrounding harassment, it is difficult to understand how much of a problem is harassment. The next section will focus on the prevalence of harassment in the university.

### *Sexual Harassment*

A 1995<sup>1</sup> study conducted by the Iowa State University Steering Committee on Diversity found that 13.5% of the female staff and 2.4% of the male staff reported that they had been sexually harassed in the last five years. The highest reported cases of sexual harassment came from merit employees, and merit employees were also reported as being the predominant harassers. Additionally, in a 1996<sup>2</sup> University Steering Committee study of the Iowa State University campus climate, many merit employees reported they worked in

---

<sup>1</sup> The 1995 and 1996 campus climate surveys were the most current research available specifically regarding Iowa State University. The quantitative research for the 1995 report was conducted in November of 1993.

<sup>2</sup> The 1995 and 1996 campus climate surveys were the most current research available specifically regarding Iowa State University. The qualitative research from the 1996 report was conducted in 1993-1994.

environments where they felt harassment occurred, but did not report it for fear of ramifications (p. 14). This same report indicated many female participants were upset with the administrations response to sexual harassment cases on campus (p. 13). It is not just employees who are victims and perpetrators of harassment.

Student-to-student or peer harassment is often overlooked in college and university policies. According to Sandler (1996a), peer-to-peer harassment often goes unnoticed and is potentially one of the most explosive areas of sexual harassment. Peer harassment ranges from teasing, sexual innuendoes, and obscenities, to sexual aggression, stalking, and rape. Sandler reports that peer harassment can be a single event or series of incidents. Like other cases of sexual harassment, peer harassment is also about power. Most often, males exercise power over females. "Between 70 and 90% of women students will experience harassment from fellow students..." (Sandler, 1996a, p. 56). A study by Shepela and Levesque (1998) found that 24 to 78% of female students studied experienced some type of gender harassment and from seven to 62% experienced unwanted sexual attention. This same study also found that up to 75% of male students experienced some type of gender harassment and up to 64% experienced unwanted sexual attention.

According to Sandler (1996a), some women are more likely to be harassed than others. First year students, women from foreign countries, women of color, women involved in women's issues, women who actively participate in class, lesbians, naïve women, and women in classes dominated by men are just a few of the types of women who Sandler reports as sexual harassment targets.



Faculty harassing other faculty and staff is another problem campuses must address. According to Seals (1996), research has shown that approximately 40% of female and 18% of male faculty members have reported experiencing sexual harassment behaviors from other faculty or staff. Seals writes that it is estimated that almost all women faculty have experienced some form of sexual harassment. She goes on to say that even though faculty are more likely to recognize specific behaviors as sexually harassing, only about 22% report incidents to the university.

Fitzgerald (1996b), found that half of the female faculty and 75% of the female administrators experienced gender harassment in the academic workplace. In addition, over 20% of the female professors reported being the object of unwanted sexual advances and 25% of the female administrators reported receiving sexual propositions. Fitzgerald reports similar findings in other studies of sexual harassment of faculty and staff in academic settings. Sandler (1996a) reports that 40-90% of women workers will experience some form of harassment and 20-50% of faculty women will experience harassment from colleagues and supervisors.

Probably the most researched area of sexual harassment on campuses is that of students harassed by faculty. Shepela and Levesque (1998) found that 46% of female students and 36% of male students experienced gender harassment from faculty. The same study found that 16% of female and 14% of male students received unwanted sexual attention from faculty. A large percentage of both male and female students experienced inappropriate behavior from faculty; however, when asked they do not identify this behavior by faculty members as sexual harassment. Kalof, Eby, Matheson, and Kroska (2001) find similar results

with 40% of undergraduate women and 28.7 % of undergraduate men experience harassment by a college professor or instructor.

According to research by Earnest (1997), he found that respondents who reported they had been discriminated against by faculty were more likely to report that the campus climate was sexist in regards to females (p. 37). Additionally, he found that students who reported being discriminated due to gender were more likely to report that gender discrimination happened often or sometimes as opposed to never or rarely.

Dziech and Weiner (1990) highlight several studies done on campuses that examine the scope of the problem of sexual harassment on campuses. Among the reports listed is a 1981 report by the Iowa State University Committee on Women, which found that between seven and 65% of the women students on campus had experienced some type of sexual harassment; however, no woman who experienced what they considered the top three most serious forms of harassment had reported it to a university official. Dziech and Weiner point out that if only one percent of college women experienced sexual harassment; there would be more than 63,000 victims. Taking into consideration that most studies report more than 20% of female students experience some form of harassment, this is a serious problem, especially when you begin to add in the number of male students, faculty, and staff who are also experiencing some form of harassment.

Dziech and Weiner (1990) provide multiple detailed examples of the kinds of harassment faced by students. They also discuss how sexual harassment is a misuse of power. Even if a student causes sexual discomfort to a male professor, this student does not have the power to affect grades, destroy self-esteem, or endanger intellectual self-confidence.

Elgart and Schanfield (1996) echo this sentiment by saying that faculty/student sexual relations are an exploitation of students, even if the student is the aggressor.

One area that has been neglected by research has been the effects on the victims and casualties of sexual harassment. Dziech and Hawkins (1998), acknowledge the fact that there are a number of deficiencies in the research that does attempt to include men. Dziech and Hawkins identify six situations involving male students that they believe need further consideration. The authors utilize other research, stories, and examples to underscore the importance of including men when considering issues of sexual harassment.

#### *Racial/Ethnic Harassment*

According to the 1995 Study of the Campus Climate at Iowa State University, more than 37% of the ethnic minority staff reported they had been discriminated against because of ethnicity and 12.2% of the ethnic minority staff reported they had been harassed due to their race/ethnicity. Additionally, a 1996 qualitative study of the campus climate at Iowa State University found that members of varying racial and ethnic backgrounds felt unwelcomed, scrutinized, or ignored by co-workers, supervisors, and students (p. 7). Additionally, African American and Latino/Hispanic employees felt that they were viewed as Affirmative Action hires. Furthermore, many who appeared “different” reported having experienced negative encounters with staff and students (p. 13). Many of the respondents also felt that the university administration lacked a commitment to diversity. They thought the university was verbally committed to issues of diversity, but the university’s actions did not display its commitment (p. 13).

It is important to remember that cultural and ethnic background may impede an individual identifying inappropriate behavior or reporting this behavior. Minority women may fear reporting any type of harassment because of potential loss of status, privileges, or promotional opportunities (Adams, 1997). Cultural beliefs regarding masculinity may prevent some men from reporting racial harassment (Dziech and Hawkins, 1998). Shame or embarrassment may prevent Chinese students from reporting any type of harassment (Tang, Yik, Cheung, Choi, Au, and Phil, 1996).

Hurtado (1992) states that in the 1980s racial conflict was becoming more prevalent on American college campuses. During that time more than one hundred campuses reported incidents of racial/ethnic harassment in the last two year's of the 1980s (1992, p. 539).

Hurtado also points out the national data show that one in four students observed considerable racial conflict at four-year institutions in the late 1980s (p. 560). The National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education (2001) reports 20% of college students of color attending predominantly white colleges have been victims of some type of racial harassment.

In a study by Kalof, Eby, Matheson, and Kroska (2001) on the influence of race and gender on student self reports of sexual harassment, they found that 30% of Blacks, 30% of Hispanics, 33% of Asians, and 30% of students of other minority groups had experienced at least one incident of harassment by a professor (p. 282). The researchers found that the most common type of harassment was gender harassment. However, once race is factored into this equation, you have to consider if the harassment is based more on gender or race. Research by Mecca and Rubin (1999) illustrate this in their findings that black women include racially

based comments by professors as sexual harassment. It is important to consider these concepts when analyzing harassment data.

Marcus (1996) highlights numerous incidences of racial/ethnic harassment on college campuses. Several African American students reported being referred to as “nigger” or overheard another African American student called “nigger,” they have had people ask if they could touch their hair, and one student reported how surprised other students were at the fact that she knew both her parents and had never lived with her grandmother (Marcus, 1996, p. 87). The issues are not just about Whites and Blacks. Sidel (1994) reports an incident where a Native American student at the University of Washington had flour poured on him so he would “know what it is like to be white,”(p. 114). In another incident at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, a Native American student was asked if she lived in a teepee (Sidel, 1994, p. 152). Marcus (1996), reports that a Hispanic student, who many students incorrectly assumed was poor based on his accent, was asked how he dealt with gangs in his neighborhood (p. 87). The Anti-Defamation League’s 1995 report showed a 17% increase of anti-Semitism on college campuses from 1994 to 1995, which makes it the seventh consecutive year that there was an increase (Marcus, 1996, p. 86).

Marcus (1996) reports other incidences of blatant harassment by faculty and staff of the university, including African American males who are constantly asked for identification, routinely stopped for questioning, or treated differently when interacting with white females. There are other reports of groups of African American students who are closely watched when they are in the bookstore, or East Asian or Indian students who are interacted with defensively by college officials (p. 88).

Students also report subtle harassment by faculty. Minority students are often called upon to represent the views of their culture or ethnic group. A black student at Vassar was asked by her professor about the Black perspective (Sidel, 1994). A Hispanic student asked what she thought Puerto Ricans would think about a certain issue, she said she would not know as she was Dominican (Marcus, 1996). According to Marcus (1996) several African American students have reported being told that Blacks do not get good preparation in high school, they rarely get called on in class, and comments get written on their papers almost surprised at how well they had done.

In a 1993 poll of 703 students at Massachusetts colleges and universities by the *Boston Globe*, 60% of students reported racial tensions at their schools; the percentage was even higher (75%) among minority students (cited from Marcus, 1996). In addition, a survey of 550 editors of student newspapers by the *US News and World Report* in 1993 cited that 49% stated race relations on their campuses were fair or poor, and 71% reported at least one racial incident on their campus in the past year (cited from Marcus, 1996).

A study by McClelland and Auster (1990) found that two-thirds of Whites described race relations at their college as positive compared to slightly over half of their Black peers. In this same study, only 3% of white students saw racial discrimination as a problem compared with 62% of Blacks. McClelland and Auster (1990) also report that Blacks were more likely than Whites to report incidents of discrimination during interviews and group discussions (p. 625). Finally, during their interviews, they found that some black students believed administrators had covered up instances of racial harassment to keep up good public appearances (p. 625).

Earnest (1997) found that students who reported instances of discrimination by faculty were more likely to report that the campus was moderately racist to racist and that none to some of the faculty were sensitive to racial and ethnic issues. Additionally, he found that many minority students found faculty to be patronizing, racist, and sexist (p. 53). He also found a positive correlation between students who had indicated they had been discriminated against by faculty and their reports that faculty were not sensitive to issues of race and ethnicity.

In a 1996 report by the *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 56% of their respondents stated that race relations on their campus had not improved over the last three years (p. 76). They go on to state that over half of their respondents did not believe the overall prospects for black students in higher education would improve in the next decade (p. 76). This report also found that a large majority of Blacks on predominantly White campuses did not believe that their institution had a strong or effective commitment to faculty diversity.

Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) report that in past studies they found that the greater the number of friends of other races Blacks had, the more comfortable they were associating with those of another race, the less they felt that Whites were racist, the more often they would consider marrying someone of a different race, and the more they felt that their own mothers were less bigoted (p. 93). In a similar study conducted, Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) found that black and white students in a primarily white university felt most comfortable in an integrated situation, such as a classroom or social situation, when each group made up about 50%, each group felt slightly less comfortable when their group was the majority, and the least comfortable when their group was the minority (p. 93).

Antonio (2001) found similar results in his research on the influence of friendship groups in college. He found that students who develop interracial friendships are more likely to socialize across race (p. 82). Thus, those who begin to develop interracial friendships perceive interracial interaction as a normal and expected behavior. Additionally, he found that interracial interaction often led to discussion of difference and diversity (p. 82). Antonio's research finds that interracial friendships and interactions are what helps characterize the multicultural campus community.

In a recent study by Baldwin, Day, and Hecht (2000) on racial attitudes of white college students, the researchers found that spheres of activity or degree of influence/contact, as opposed to spheres of identity, may differentiate racial intolerances (p. 570). For example, Whites may support having minorities on faculty, but oppose having them in higher ranking positions such as administrators or directors. This study also posits that Whites may favor individual-held attitudes, but oppose those that address group-help power (p. 571).

The effects of harassment are not just felt by those who are harassed; they are also felt by co-workers, friends, and family. Racial harassment creates a hostile working environment, which hampers employees' commitment to their employer. This affects the company's and employee's productivity and causes poor moral on the job (Chen and Kleiner, 1999). Because of all the problems that harassment causes, it causes us to question what kind of person becomes a harasser.



## **Profile of a Harasser**

### *Harassment and Power*

Before we can effectively address the profile of a harasser, it is important to understand that harassment is about gaining and maintaining power. “A dominant group, to maintain its status in the hierarchy, will seek to keep others in lower positions. One powerful way to accomplish this is through discursive practices,” writes Yep (1998, p. 80). Yep notes that the dominant group determines the status of everyone else. This group decides what is normal, desirable, right, and successful (p. 80). Halualani (1998) discusses how culture is linked with power. She writes that the dominant group and its belief systems control the power to determine what “culture” is and how it will serve (p. 265). Halualani believes there is a struggle between the dominant groups who reproduce their ideologies and the socially oppressed groups who shape culture in terms of their experiences (p. 265). This is very important in terms of power and harassment. Dominant groups may express their power by harassing those in marginalized groups. By not doing anything, these marginalized groups may help perpetuate a culture where harassment is common.

Hall (1993) says that power is a complicated issue for groups working from the margins. Many individuals equate power, instead of the abuse of power, with evil (p. 169). Often power is viewed in terms of a dichotomy such as oppressor/oppressed or good/bad (p. 169). Individuals place themselves on one or the other side of the dichotomy. When individuals place themselves on the side of the oppressed or powerless, they take the position of nonresponsibility, they become the done unto, never the doer (p. 169). If an individual sees power as evil, she/he may waste any power she/he has by not using it to help themselves or

others. By taking this position of complete innocence, an individual essentially relinquishes any power she/he might have. After all, by asserting their power they will no longer be innocent.

Hall (1993) believes that another problem individuals have in terms of power is that they tend to look upward in the hierarchy to gauge the extent of their power (p. 170). However, because most women and minorities are marginalized to some degree, there is always someone else to look to who “really” has the power (p.170). Instead, Hall suggests that we should also look around us and downward to people believed to have less power if we truly want to gauge how much power we have.

According to Quina (1996), it is an enormous power gain for the harasser when the victim does not report the incident, or when the institutions do not respond to the reports of harassment. Another way that harassers gain power is through victim self-blame (Rabinowitz, 1996). Others question the victim, suggesting that she or he encouraged or enjoyed the behavior. This reinforces the self-blame, or at least makes the victim question her/his complicity related to the harassment.

Shoop and Sandler (1996) state that sexual harassment has more to do with power than with sex (p. 7). Harassment occurs when there is a power imbalance. A boss, faculty member, or supervisor has the power to affect the job, tenure, or education of an employee, coworker, or student. One with greater power may easily intimidate individuals with less power. The power structure is not just about those with more formal power, it also applies to those with informal power. Men quite often have physical power over women. Women of color who experience harassment face the question of whether the harassment is due to

gender or race. Additionally, women of color can face harassment from men and white women.

DeFour (1996) also discusses the harassment of women of color. She believes that two major factors make women of color more vulnerable to harassment. First, many women of color are financially vulnerable. As students, they are dependent upon financial aid, have loans, or work in low paying jobs to support themselves. As employees in an academic setting, many of their faculty positions are short-term contracts or non-tenure track positions, or they serve in supervised positions, such as secretaries, housekeepers, and cooks. The second factor that DeFour identifies is the stereotypical image of women of color. Many of the stereotypes portray minority women as weak (Native American and Asian) or very sexual (African American or Hispanic). Because both stereotypes emphasize vulnerability, minority women may be seen as easy victims of harassment. Quina states, “minority women are more frequently asked for sexual favors or dates, and subject to more sexually offensive gestures,” (1996, p. 184).

van Dijk (1987) identifies three categories that characterize dominant group relationships with racial and ethnic minorities: difference and inferiority, competition, and threat. Each of these categories represents some type of power struggle. If the dominant group sees the “other” as different, therefore inferior, the “other” does not need to be treated equally. The dominant group may see a member of a racial or ethnic minority as someone who is competing for a job, a house, or even for the country. The ethnic or racial minority member may be seen as a threat, which will change the dominant way of life.

### *Sexual Harasser*

To understand sexual harassment, one must also understand the type of person who commits the violation of sexual harassment. Unfortunately, there are no infallible predictors for recognizing a perpetrator of sexual harassment. Dziech and Weiner (1990) suggest “that sexual harassers are people who misuse the power of their positions to abuse members of the opposite sex” (p. 125). The authors believe that we can understand sexual harassers by characterizing the roles they assume: the counselor-helper, the confidante, the intellectual seducer, the opportunist, and the power broker.

Dziech and Weiner (1990) believe that when a professor finds himself in a position where he is not fulfilling his financial or career expectations, he may demonstrate his masculinity in negative ways (p. 140). He may take out his frustration on female colleagues or students in various forms of harassment. The authors believe the mid-life crisis is the most frequent explanation for harassment. If men in academe discover they are falling into a mid-life crisis, they find themselves in a unique position. Not only are they watching their youth slip away, but they are also surrounded by tempting young women and the young men who remind them of who they once were or desired to be. Men suffering from sexual insecurity may find college women to be the perfect target for harassment leading to sexual activity. Many young women are naïve enough to fall victim to the flattery of an older, more mature male professor. If the special attention that the student is receiving leads to sexual activity, the professor may convince himself that the young woman is responding to his sexuality, not his position.

A male professor who is suffering from sexual insecurity may look to these younger women for several reasons. First, younger women may have less sexual experience than more mature women, leading to lower sexual expectations from the male. Second, a young woman may have fewer demands on a male professor, as she is probably not looking for a permanent relationship. Third, a male professor may be able to dominate the young woman by convincing her of all the things a person in his position can do for her.

A male professor who suffers from a self-identity or self-esteem crisis may perceive the young men in his class as competition. Many men do not view education as a masculine profession. One way to prove that the professor or the job is masculine is to demonstrate to the young men that he can control or “get” the younger women.

Fitzgerald and Weitzman (1990) conducted research to profile the social and sexual interaction between male faculty and students from the faculty members’ perspective. Several items of interest were found in this study. First, 37% of the male professors indicated they attempted to initiate personal relationships with both male and female students. Of these, nearly half reported that the behavior was directed only at female students. Over 25% indicated they had dated students and slightly more indicated they had sexual relationships with students. Eleven percent said they had tried to touch, stroke, or caress a student. These are relatively high numbers for a study of 235 professors. The second, and most interesting, yet disturbing factor, is that only one professor believed he had sexually harassed a student, but 14 believed they had been sexually harassed by their female students. In identifying characteristics of these harassers, the authors found no statistical links among colleagues in

respect to age, marital status, rank, or academic discipline that would indicate a certain type of faculty is more prone to commit harassment (p. 130).

Fitzgerald and Weitzman (1990) did similar research on women harassers. Although they found that many women faculty developed friendships with students, most of the women had friendships with men and women and some exclusively with women. None of their subjects reported having relationships solely with men (p. 135). Even with the high number of friendships, the authors found that only seven percent reported dating a student and fewer reported having sexual relationships with students. One very important finding in these studies is that men were more likely to label a wider variety of student behavior “sexual harassment,” and they were also more likely to date or have sex with their students, which was not considered harassment (p. 135). The authors conclude that based on their own and others’ research, it is possible for women to harass men, but it is highly unlikely.

According to Rupert and Holms (1997), it is not just the faculty who can be blamed for inappropriate behavior, schools may inadvertently be contributing to relationships between faculty and students. The authors point out that there is often a lot of ambiguity regarding the appropriateness of certain types of behaviors. Because of the roles that faculty play, advisor, mentor, and instructor, it is not surprising that multiple relationships form between faculty and students.

Zalk (1996) identifies four dimensions used to develop profiles of male sexual harassers. Zalk’s dimensions are a continuum; one’s position on one dimension may suggest a trend on another. The first dimension is the public versus the private harasser. Both types of harassers gain satisfaction from the misuse of their power; however, the dynamics of their

operation differ (p. 91). The public harasser is competitive and likes to show off to his colleagues and students. His way of demonstrating his manhood is by letting other men know he is one of the boys. On the other extreme is the private harasser. The deception is part of the gratification he gets, it is what the others do not know that excites him. The power for this type of harasser is in his secrets.

The seducer/demander versus the receptive non-initiator is the second dimension. The seducer/demander seeks out and plots sexual contact with students. This person uses his power as a professor to get what he wants from students. The seducer/demander feels threatened by women and rejects their place in higher education. The receptive non-initiator does not initiate sexual overtures, but will not dissuade a student who does. He gets his power from recognizing the students disadvantage in this relationship. This person wants to be sought out, so he tends to his appearance and takes on a role of confidante or mentor that encourages trust.

The third dimension is the untouchable versus the risk taker. The untouchable operates as if he is above the system and that the rules do not apply to him. He is egocentric and pompous. This person on one hand will appear to be the model spouse or parent and on the other hand accompany a student with whom he is sexually or physically interested in to public events and functions. The risk taker knows he is out of line and that he may have to pay the consequences for his actions. He fluctuates between excitement, guilt, and fear. He often punishes his lover for being a temptress and displays irritable behavior with others.

The infatuated versus the sexual conqueror is the fourth dimension. The infatuated is sincere and genuinely cares about women, although a long term relationship or marriage to

one of his students is rarely on the agenda. This individual is “in love” and is looking for an emotional affirmation and gratification rather than just sex. However, it is not just unfortunate that he falls for a student; part of the infatuation depends on the power differential. The power in this relationship is with the infatuated, who wants to be looked up to, to teach and guide, to be the center of attention, and to have greater wisdom (Zalk, 1996, p. 102). Whereas the infatuated knows and remembers each of his women, the sexual conqueror knows very little and remembers even less. The sexual conqueror is concerned more with numbers than anything else. He is a womanizer, may maintain several lovers at any one time and engages in frequent one-night-stands.

Zalk (1996) believes that characteristics of a harasser are multidimensional and that the characteristics of a harasser can be found on each of these continuums. Zalk’s (1996) theories were developed based upon the research of others, as well as her own experiences.

#### *Racial/Ethnic Harasser*

Just as sexual harassment is about power, so is racial harassment. Bowser, Auletta, and Jones (1993) identify racism as three things: “(a) a cultural presumption in one race’s superiority and another’s inferiority; (b) institutional practices that reinforce and fulfill the cultural presumption; and (c) individual beliefs in the racist cultural presumption and institutional practices” (preface xii). In other words, institutional racism can be described as one group having particular advantages over another based on race, especially when the disadvantaged group has a past history of colonization (Anderson, 1988). Racism itself is not a problem of color, but of historical relationships based on values granted to particular racial



categories where color is used to justify inequality (Asante, 1998). Whereas racism may be a function of the institution's structure, it is maintained and perpetuated by individuals.

Larson and Olvando (2001) define institutionalized racism as the assumption that white superiority unconsciously shapes the norms and practices of the institution (p. 123). This assumption has to do with the White history of racism and racially based social structures. Throughout the history of the United States, Whites have viewed themselves as superior to non-whites. For example, Whites slaughtered and segregated Native Americans because they were viewed as unintelligent, uneducated, and savage. They enslaved Africans, who were forcibly taken from their home countries and brought to the United States. Even after being "freed" from years of enslavement and abuse, Blacks were not viewed as equal by Whites. The United States has gone through years of slavery, segregation, desegregation, Equal Rights, and Affirmative Action. Because minorities have not yet been able to gain complete equality, it is not surprising that Whites still view themselves as superior. This may consciously or unconsciously cause them to continue to act and enforce behaviors contributing to this hegemonic order.

One point that Larson and Olvando (2001) make is that even though racism is oppressive, it is not always the intent of those who act in a particular way and it is not always done by a malicious individual. "Institutional racism, then, is a sedimented system of historical inequalities that are effectively sustained through practices that fail to interrupt established patterns of racial and ethnic hierarchy, exclusion, and discrimination," write Larson and Olvando (2001, p. 123).

Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) identify eight ways in which institutions of higher education dominate and control the lives of minority individuals. First, institutions of higher education often have biased admission standards that result in fewer minority students on college campuses. Second, many faculty members have low expectations of minority student performance. Third, most student activities are organized primarily for white students. Fourth, many counselors and advisors are not knowledgeable or even aware of minority students' problems and concerns. Fifth, only a limited number of courses offer topics related to minority students. Sixth, few minority personnel have power roles that could be used in the decision-making processes. Seventh, when programs are developed for minority students they are often under funded and understaffed. Finally, many institutes of higher education commit only a very small amount, if any, of funds to support minority student programs. While none of these things seem like harassment, they are forms of prejudice and discrimination that do fall under the definitions of racial/ethnic harassment.

van Dijk (1987) believes that prejudice and discrimination are not individual properties of people, but instead essentially social (p. 11). van Dijk's research offers three properties of racial and ethnic prejudice: It is a group attitude shared by members of the dominant group, the objects of the attitude are the minority group(s), and the evaluation of the dominant group's attitude is negative (p. 195). While prejudice itself is not harassment, but by definition, any overt or covert acts of prejudice can be considered harassment.

## **Effects of Harassment**

### *Identity and Identity Formation*

To fully understand the effects of harassment, individuals must understand identity and identity formation. Hecht, Collier, and Ribeau (1993) state that identity is constructed as both individually and socially emerging in dialectic between the two. One part of identity is self identity. Kirk and Okazawa-Rey (2000) define an individual's identity as a marker of how they define themselves at a particular moment in life. Each individual has his or her own unique identity that continues to grow, change, and renew throughout life (p. 49). Nance and Foeman (1998) add the notion of self-concept and self esteem to the discussion on identity. "Self-concept is the socially constructed image one has of oneself, and self-esteem is the value one has for oneself as well as one's perception of worth"(1998, p. 59).

Identity is not just how one feels about one's self; it is also related to socially constructed identity based on an individual's race, ethnicity, religion, sexuality, and gender. According to Nance and Foeman, "we learn from others how our social world is divided into categories and where we fit with respect to those categories" (1998, p. 54). Every day, we receive messages on how we fit into these categories and how these categories fit into society's overall scheme. "The identity that we avow may not be the one that is ascribed to us by others," (Nance and Foeman, 1998, p. 54).

According to Yep (1998) identity is political, fluid, and nonsummative (p. 79). Identity is political because it "separates individuals on the basis of ingroup-outgroup differences" (Yep, 1998, p. 79). It is fluid because it is ever evolving, changing, and growing. It is nonsummative because it is not a sum of one's background. Yep also states that our

identity is constantly co-created and re-created with our everyday interactions (p. 81). Identity is not just created by others; an individual must participate in the process of co-creating and re-creating an identity. According to Yep, an individual must participate in the process of co-creating and re-creating an identity.

Yep (1998) also discusses the concepts of prescription and identity freezing. Both prescription and identity freezing are acts of domination whereby one individual imposes an assumed identity on another. An individual may prescribe a label of unintelligent because she/he came from a poor section of town. A minority woman may have her identity frozen as highly sexual because of stereotypes of her race or ethnicity. Although they constitute domination, prescription and identity freezing may not always be intentional.

Both the identified and the identifier are responsible for the process of identity creation. If an individual accepts a stereotype that has been placed on her/him or if she/he does nothing to challenge this stereotype, she/he is responsible for letting someone else aid in the (re)creation of their identity.

The formation of identity is a complex process that includes the interplay between individual choices, life events, individual and group expectations, and societal categorization, classification, and socialization (Kirk and Okazawa-Rey, 2000, p. 49). Golden, Niles, and Hecht (1998) discuss the communication theory of identity. They identify four propositions that show how communication and identity shape each other. First, identity is formed, maintained, and modified through social interaction. Second, identity influences interaction through shaping expectations and motivation behavior. Third, identity is enacted in social

interaction, and the conditions of interaction influence identity enactments. Fourth, identity is an individual and social event.

The communication of harassment affects both the self and social identity. Those who are witnesses or victims of sexual and racial harassment, and those who harass, may experience direct or indirect effects to their own perceptions of self identity. If harassment continues, its effects may also become normalized into our social and cultural identities. Harassment does not just affect identity; it has numerous other effects on both the individual and on the institution.

#### *Effects on the Individual*

According to Elgart and Schanfield (1996), “sexual harassment in American higher education is currently a problem of ethics and values rather than a problem of law. The consequences of experiencing sexual harassment can range from short-term discomfort to long term psychological effects” (Elgart and Schanfield, 1996, p. 158). Lott (1996) writes that sexual harassment reinforces personal vulnerability, teaches women to be “on guard,” increases ambiguity of men’s sexual behaviors, increases anxiety and self-doubt, and teaches the target to believe she is not a virtuous or competent woman. Lott also offers consequences for the sexual harassers. Harassers who get away with it have their behavior reinforced, possibly increasing the likelihood of recurrence; they learn they are powerful, increasing the likelihood they will continue to exert their power; and suffer confusion of normal sexual expression (culturally acceptable) and deviant behavior.

Rabinowitz (1996) addresses the effects sexual harassment has on female victims. She also looks at how students cognitively view harassment and why there is such resistance

to acknowledging victimization. Finally, her research discusses the consequences of harassment and provides advice for advocates and counselors to help the victim become a survivor.

Sandler and Shoop (1996) explain that sexual harassment is often treated as a joke and not taken seriously. Because of this, women may be reluctant to discuss their experiences for fear of repercussions, or because they believe that their character will be damaged. The authors discuss the physical and mental symptoms associated with sexual harassment. Sandler and Shoop also discuss how sexual harassment impacts men. Most of their information is similar to that presented by Lott (1996). However, they do point out how sexual harassment reinforces stereotypes of women as sex objects, which may cause other men to become less open to working with women and to discriminate against women. If faculty and students allow sexual harassment, it may send the message that this behavior is acceptable. As men move through their careers, they may find that this behavior is unacceptable and leads to employer criticism or termination.

The effects of racial/ethnic harassment range from psychological to societal. Psychological effects range anywhere from loss of self-esteem to assimilation to actually becoming the person that society says they are. Not only does harassment cause internal pain for the victims, it also prevents the sharing of knowledge, values, and cultures. It keeps individuals from learning about others and understanding differences. Also, it maintains a segregated society.

Harassment through language can have devastating effects on an individual.

“Offensive speech is deliberate public or private language intended to ridicule, pose a threat,

or belittle a person or persons because of cultural or racial origin, religious practice, political beliefs, or sexual orientation,” writes Asante (1998, p. 90). Words such as spook, nigger, spick, and chink create highly emotional responses. This language is often used to produce effects that temporarily disable its victim (Collins, 1998). The individual may be disabled by surprise or anger that she/he does not know how to respond. In either case, the victim’s response is disabled, and the perpetrator succeeds in dominating the victim. This may lead to bottling up of feelings and emotions. Fear, anger, depression, loss of self-esteem, humiliation, alienation, and a sense of vulnerability are just some of the effects of hate speech and symbols.

### *Effects on the Institution*

Historically there have been very negative responses to hate speech and racism: campus riots, fights, and vandalism. While these are very significant, there are many other reactions that have just as much or even more of an effect on society. One of these effects is the perpetuation of stereotypes through racism. The longer racist dialogue is used, the more it affects us. Most of us, beginning in our youth, learn about white male history in our schools and in our homes. When learning about women and minority issues in history, we learn that Betsy Ross sewed the flag, Blacks were slaves, Native Americans were savages, therefore, segregated or slaughtered, and we learn about wars with Mexico. In all of this learning we rarely hear the other side to the story, possibly how the white man was bad or wrong. By not teaching the whole truth, educators reinforce White and male supremacy along with racist and sexist ideologies.

However, an argument against the lack of diverse education can be made. Women's studies courses have been around approximately 30-40 years, growing out of the idea that women and women's issues are worth learning about (Kesselman, McNair, and Schniedewind, 2003). The idea of multicultural feminisms has also brought about education on a variety of feminist issues related to various cultures, ethnicities, and has encouraged a more global perspective of women. In addition to women's studies course, various ethnic studies courses and departments have also developed across campuses over the last 30-40 years. Many social science classes are also incorporating gender, racial, and ethnic diversity concepts into their courses.

Even though these are significant steps in creating a more multicultural education, there are still some problems. According to Ruth (1998) schools from the primary grades still teach the three Rs and the recognized "knowledge" found in books (p. 423). This is the traditional white lessons in history, literature, English, and etc. Additionally, even though colleges offer women's and ethnic studies courses, the required participation in these classes is very minimal. A student may have to take one three-hour U.S. diversity class and one three-hour international perspectives class; however, depending on the individual's major, those six hours may be the only diversity education she/he receives. Having some diversity education is better than none. Conversely, unless incorporating diversity into other types of classes becomes a requirement, it will be very difficult to challenge the ideas and notions that have had 18 years to develop. In addition, what about those students who do not attend college, how will they learn that gender, race, and ethnic issues are important? This education needs to begin at a much earlier age.



Although our education system tells us that we should value diversity, no one ever really tells us what is diversity, largely because we can not agree on a definition. Our schools may celebrate diversity for a day, week, or month, but we do not learn about racism, oppression, and harassment. We learn that the United States is a melting pot and the land full of opportunities. We are told of equal opportunity and brought up to believe in meritocracy, that those who work hard will succeed. This also implies that those who are not successful are apparently lazy or poor workers. “The schools are deeply implicated in the reproduction of inequality in American society, by teaching a meritocratic ideology and by implementing a utilitarian social ethic in their day to day practices,” writes Bonacich (2000, p. 71).

The media often reinforces these beliefs. Minorities are depicted as gang members, druggies, criminals, or welfare recipients. Eventually, racist language begins to slip into the unconsciousness. When a family member or a stranger makes a comment or joke about a “lazy Mexican” or “job stealing nigger,” the language and its meaning begin to enter our thoughts and eventually our words and actions. “Well before entering college, young people have gotten the messages— subtle and not-so-subtle —from family, peers, and the media about the appropriate racial hierarchy,” (Kent, 1996, p. 86). Eventually, our children, without proper education, repeat this cycle of stereotypes and racism.

“Whether it is an extension of or a reaction against its history, an institution’s present always reflects its past, and that past influences the harassment issue profoundly” (Dziech and Hawkins, 1998, p.560). Harassment affects more than just individuals, it also affects the institution as a whole. Sandler and Shoop (1996) address the fact that sexual harassment incidents not only lead to formal charges and lawsuits, but also to bad publicity and

controversy. As a result the institution may suffer lower morale, high turnover, and a drop in student applications.

Another problem that an institution must face is letting harassment become a normative behavior. Shepela and Levesque (1998) found that some types of behaviors are so common they are considered normative. Shepela and Levesque believe that when certain behaviors are labeled as normal, instead of harassing, it can lead people to believe that no psychological harm has been done, and that therefore no real harassment has occurred. They hypothesize that when harassment becomes a normative behavior, it can be detrimental to the institution when trying a harassment case.

Dziech and Hawkins (1998) discuss multiple examples of the total cost of sexual harassment. They go beyond the concepts presented by Sandler and Shoop by discussing the role of the “nonvictims.” The nonvictims include those who support the victim and others who happen to be caught in the crossfire.

Stereotypes and racist beliefs can lead to loss of individuality and culture. Bonacich (2000) gives the example of a battle at the University of California over Chicano Student Programs. The administration of the university is trying to get this program to disassociate itself from other Chicano programs, such as resource centers and outreach programs, and focus solely on academic achievement. In referring to the administration, Bonacich writes, “It wants them to forget about their culture, their community, and particularly to forget any identification they may feel for their community’s oppression. It wants them to put all their energies into ‘making it’” (2000, p. 73).

In his interviews with black students at a predominantly white campus, Feagin (1992) gives several examples of loss of individuality. The first example is that many individuals see Blacks as all alike. One student reported that professors, students, and staff members kept asking her if she was an athlete. When she said no, individuals seemed surprised that there would be any other reason a black student would be on their campus. This same student also reported that although she and her roommates were all black, they looked nothing alike. However, other students in the dorms constantly called her by her roommates' names.

Another example Feagin (1992) gives is that Blacks learn about White culture, but Whites do not learn about Black American subculture unless they take a course. Of course, once a white student has had her or his "diversity" course, she or he will know all they need to know. Whites prefer to see Blacks with straightened, as opposed to natural hairstyles and using "White" English, instead of "Black" slang. Students in Feagin's research also point out that Blacks are viewed as more respectable when seen as part of white groups and discussions. Also, all Black groups are viewed as threatening and undesirable by Whites. This is just another reminder that a minority group's distinction is not acceptable.

Social and professional alienation is another effect of racial/ethnic harassment. Often, minorities in academe work in an educational system that is unsupportive or even hostile. Because of this environment, they feel alienated from their coworkers, peers, students, and even their campus and community. There are multiple reasons for this alienation. Good mentoring relationships are important tools that provide guidance and feedback on writing and research, and in establishing professional networks (Woods, 2001). The lack of mentoring relationships affects the acclimation of a new faculty member to the campus

community. Not only does this prevent the faculty member from getting to know the campus, it also prevents her/him from establishing professional contacts needed to succeed. The faculty who lack mentoring often do not learn how to be successful mentors to other faculty and students. The failure to give and receive successful mentoring, may keep the individual disconnected from the college or university setting.

Individuals may become alienated when they retreat to their “comfort zone.” Williams (2001) tells the story about a law professor who received a picture of a gorilla in her campus mailbox. An unidentified individual attacked the professor’s “intellect and her human dignity” (p. 97). Because of this attack, the professor sought refuge in the comfort of her own office. In this case, the woman essentially alienated herself from others and remained on guard. When individuals are on guard, they may keep others at a distance, thus perpetuating alienation.

Additionally, minorities become alienated through classes and textbooks that reflect the ideologies of the dominant culture. When faculty and students are constantly bombarded with white supremacist ideologies, it is bound to reinforce racist perceptions. When minority faculty members hold positions dealing only with minority issues, they may not be thought of as being experts in other areas. They may be “forgotten about” when it comes to committee work, decision making, or even by students once they complete their required diversity class. On the other hand, they may become overloaded with minority-related campus issue work. After all, only minorities should care about these issues.

“Shallow education” refers to both formal and informal educational experiences that faculty, staff, and students receive in an institution of higher education. Informally, we all get

some type of education during our time on a college or university campus. Campuses that are not widely diverse with their staff and students may inadvertently or intentionally reinforce white supremacist or dominant culture beliefs.

When a campus is not supportive of its diverse faculty, faculty members may begin to leave in search of a more diverse, or at least a more accepting environment. As minority faculty leave, they take with them the culture, history, and perspectives that are crucial to a truly diverse environment and education. Because minority faculty are often associated with diversity classes, these courses may go with them when they leave. Often, these diversity classes are the only exposure some students have to a non-white faculty member. The loss of minority individuals who teach university core courses, such as English, history, sociology, or communication, means the loss of any diversity in these programs as well.

A diverse faculty and staff is key to attracting diverse students. It may be easier for minority students to identify with minority faculty and staff. "I have worked with many young women of color who were silently screaming to get more information about themselves and about women who looked like them, acted like them, talked like them, and dreamed some of the same dreams they did when they were their age," writes Williams (2001, p. 98). Minority faculty play a crucial role in getting minority students to graduate and in motivating them to pursue advanced degrees. Lack of minority professionals limits access by minority students to role models and mentors.

A lack of diversity in research topics also leads to "shallow education." Often Blacks are dissuaded from studying or researching in areas of interest to them, especially in areas related to minority issues. Feagin (1992) describes a situation in which a student was told by

her professor that she should not write essays about Black people, because White people would not understand what was going on. “The professor regarded her stories about the distinctiveness of the Black experience as somehow not as universal as classical stories about the White experience” (Feagin, 1992, pp. 557-558).

In referring to research and publications, Jarmon (2001) explains that because of her colleague’s disinterest in her, she often had to reach out beyond her department and university to be able to collaborate on research projects. Although she was working on projects related to teen pregnancy, people working in the same area referred to her work as different (p. 181). Woods (2001) also explains that people of color are cautioned by other people of color to de-emphasize racial aspects of their work (p. 113).

According to Anderson (1988), works by black authors are often discredited by white scholars claiming they are unscholarly, polemical, rhetorical, or propagandistic. When work by minority scholars challenges the dominant consensus or varies with racial mythology, white mainstream scholars claim the work is unscientific (p. 268). This results in the lack of publications by minority scholars in prestigious white journals. Minority scholars are often forced to publish in specialized race journals or periodicals. Consistent publication in these journals causes mainstream white scholars to question and challenge the merit and significance of the minority author’s work. The failure to encourage and promote research on issues of diversity perpetuates shallow education. If individuals cannot research these issues and publicize them, how can they be accurate in what they teach? By preventing individuals from learning about themselves, their histories and by promoting only research that deals

with the dominant culture, institutions promote assimilation and Anglo-conformity, not integration.

Assimilation is the act of teaching and learning sameness. Instead of valuing diversity, it values and rewards those who adapt to dominant cultures and beliefs. “I never have stopped trying to assimilate. And I have succeeded in all the traditional ways —the planet’s highest college degree in the language of the dominant and a job reproducing those ways”

(Villanueva, 1998 p. 239). In this narrative, the subject, a minority by birth, reproduces the ways of the dominant culture. He purposefully distances himself from the Latino culture and focuses on contemporary English discourse (American discourse). Even this assimilation has brought contradictions. This scholar experiences both the feeling of community within the professional community and the feeling of being alone, an outsider based on his differences.

In *Talking Back*, hooks writes:

While assimilation is seen as an approach that ensures the successful entry of Black people into the mainstream, at its very core it is dehumanizing. Embedded in the logic of assimilation is the white supremacist assumption that blackness must be eradicated so that a new self, in this case a “white” self, can come into being. (1989, p.67)

Gonzales (1998) identifies some individuals who assimilate as “hegemonic police” (p. 230). “They are the tokenized senior scholars of ethnic studies whose work essentializes their group to the delight of the hierarchy and who gained their status through novelty” (p.230). These are the minorities who use their knowledge of the oppressed group with whom they

affiliate, to confuse the oppressed and promote the dominant culture. They are the ones who overtly oppose white supremacy and patriarchy, but covertly act to uphold these beliefs.

Another form of assimilation is by those who are “color-blind.” Color-blindness is often used to mask the discomfort that many individuals feel when confronted with issues of diversity. Educators who follow the belief of a color-blind society often silence issues of race and ethnicity. Instead of talking about differences in growing up Black, Hispanic, or Asian, the color-blind stance assumes that there are no differences. This denies individual curiosity by suppressing much needed dialogue at all levels of education (Williams, 1997). It also promotes the notion that there is nothing different about minorities and that it is their own fault that they can not get ahead in society.

According to de la Luz Reyes and Halcon (2000), overt acts of harassment are often used in situations where minorities are vying for positions formerly occupied by Whites. Overt harassment is often a political tactic designed to evoke notions of supremacy. For example, de la Luz Reyes and Halcon, use the example of a school dean who made the comment, “What do they think this is, Taco University?” in response to an increased number of Chicano applicants for a faculty position (2000, p. 85). According to Asante (1998) a white individual may not communicate racism in the presence of Blacks; however, it may occur in the presence of Whites (p. 89). In *Illiberal Education*, D’Souza (1991) references an incident at University of Michigan in which a flier declaring “open season” on “porch monkeys” was slid into a lounge where a group of black women were meeting (p.124). Although D’Souza actively voices his opinion, questioning Affirmative Action and promoting the status quo, he gives multiple examples of overt racism occurring in academe.



This type of overt racism not only evokes responses of white supremacy, it also creates a hostile environment for minorities and supporters of minority issues.

The effects of racism are too numerous to cover in this paper. But it is important to see how these effects are used to promote and perpetuate the white supremacist, patriarchal, hegemonic order in higher education. The various authors have shown the multiple and diverse effects that harassment can have on the staff, students, and the institution. The question now becomes how we can educate the campus community about all the issues concerned with harassment. One popular way has been through the creation of harassment policies.

### **Creating a Policy**

According to a study by Olivas (1992), prior to 1990 Iowa State University did not have a policy on racial harassment. In fact, it was not until 1994 that Iowa State University created a sexual harassment policy, followed by a racial harassment policy in 1999.

Olivas (1992) uses Goggin, Bowman, Lester, and O'Toole's implementation theory to demonstrate how to measure the effectiveness of implementation of legal change on campuses. He first discusses tractability, which states "that the problem area or issue is solvable to some degree by a series of policies and actions" (p. 585). Tractability of the problem is measured by four variables: technical difficulties, diversity of target group behavior, target group as a percentage of the population, and the extent of behavioral change required. Second, he discusses the ability to structure implementation (p. 588). Structure implementation is made up of seven parts: clear and consistent objectives, adequate causal theory, adequacy of funding, hierarchical integration, favorable decision rules, commitment

of implementers, and the extent to which there is formal access by outsiders. For example, for a university to implement a harassment policy they must begin by having one or more objectives that they can identify and measure, they must keep the project within financial constraints, they must be able to develop a project that meets the needs of all individuals within the organization, and they must have strong commitment by those who are implementing the program. If any one of these things is not there, the project will not be successfully implemented into the structure of the organization. Olivas states, “academic policymakers have substantial opportunities and resources to shape legal policy and smooth the way for legal changes on campus” (1992, p. 594).

Creating a solid policy and program about harassment has a two-fold purpose: it should shield an institution from liability by demonstrating a concern about the issue and, most importantly, it should address and prevent the problem more effectively (Sandler, 1996b, p. 104). Sandler identifies four purposes of a good policy: 1) demonstrate the schools commitment to prevent and deal with harassment, 2) educate employees and students about the issues, 3) set fourth the procedures and sanctions for dealing with instances of harassment, and 4) encourage persons to come forward with problems (p. 105).

Dziech and Hawkins (1998) also offer what they believe are the basic standards of a good policy and practice: 1) provide the campus with a coherent and comprehensive definition of harassment, 2) issue a strong policy statement expressing disapproval of the behavior, 3) establish an accessible grievance procedure for both formal and informal complaints, 4) conduct student, faculty, and staff programs that educate all about the problem, and 5) employ multiple sources of information to communicate the policy and

procedure (p. 31). Fitzgerald (1996c) lists similar findings and adds an additional item: the publicizing of the statistics on harassment complaints and their outcomes.

Deadrick, McAfee, and Champagne (1996) discuss ideas on how to create a culture of respect. They believe that developing a “cultural” approach in dealing with harassment should concentrate on getting employees to view the adoption of anti-harassment policies and procedures as a choice made by them to improve the quality of their working environment (p. 68). They also believe that creating a policy on anti-harassment needs to involve multiple employees to ensure a sense of ownership in the project.

While creating a harassment policy and procedure may sound fairly straightforward, there are multiple issues and obstacles that have to be addressed. Wonders (1996) discusses some of the barriers that affect the policy development process. She identifies several myths that people believe hinder the policy process. For example, such things as sexual harassment policies are just another way for women to complain; change is good, but will not work here; or sexual harassment is too complex of a problem, a new policy will not make a difference.

Dziech and Hawkins (1998) identify some additional considerations universities have when developing a policy on harassment. One consideration is size. A large university will have a much more difficult time educating the staff and students about policy and procedure than a small university or college. Another consideration has to do with the concern for public image. Universities often want to keep a low profile when it comes to problems with sexual harassment. This often leads to ineffective responses or stonewalling. They finally suggest that the sex ratios, power distribution, and unionization are also areas of contention when it comes to creating policy and procedure.

One final obstacle that must be considered is freedom of speech. Some believe that the process of trying to limit the liability of the institution and individuals will result in the over-enforcement of political correctness, others believe it will cause a “chilling effect” on faculty confused about what types of speech are prohibited by regulation (Dziech and Hawkins, 1998, p. 18). Many believe that faculty members should have the freedom to choose teaching techniques or use examples that convey the lesson they are trying to teach. On the other hand, students also have the right to education without feeling like they are being harassed. The issue of freedom of speech not only encompasses the language used by faculty, but it also extends into the various forms of campus media, e-mail, and other educational tools.

While creating a policy is a significant step in the process of preventing harassment, it is equally important that employees are educated about the policy and what constitutes harassment of all kinds.

### **Harassment Prevention Education and Training**

The university also has to consider how to educate the entire campus about harassment prevention. Not only do they have to worry about educating the entire campus, they must also consider what type(s) of training work(s) best to educate a diversity of people. Historically, harassment prevention training has taken several forms, from a pamphlet delivered to all employees, to some type of orientation, to videos, or to group lectures or discussions. The one thing the university must consider is if the training programs effectively serve the needs of and the learning styles of all its employees.

### *Sexual Harassment*

Even though colleges and universities establish laws and policies against harassment, they often fail to educate faculty, staff, and students about harassment issues. “There is consensus on campus that sexual harassment is bad behavior and should be stopped. And what more appropriate place for reform to begin than the academic community” (Dziech and Weiner, 1990, p. 163).

Although Dziech and Weiner (1990) do not give an actual educational plan for teaching and learning about harassment, they do give a breakdown of tasks and suggestions for students, parents, administrators, and faculty to help prevent and educate about sexual harassment. Dziech and Weiner believe that it is the responsibility of everyone associated with the institution; however, it is also the responsibility of the men and women who work there to lead the way (p. 183).

Biaggio and Brownell (1996) specifically deal with strategies of prevention and change. One key area they address is attitudes about sexual harassment. The authors identify three groups of attitudes that foster the acceptance, therefore preventing the elimination of sexual harassment: 1) the stereotypical view of heterosexual relationships, which denies harassment is a problem; 2) the power differential, which acknowledges power and defines harassers as superiors; and 3) the adherence of gender-role norms, that maintain male dominance of females. The authors list an array of interventions to challenge these attitudes, including disseminating information through student orientations, incorporating concepts in introductory classes, and publicizing articles on offenders and offenses in the school

newspaper. One problem with their ideas is that they did not incorporate ideas to educate faculty and staff.

Helly (1996) gives an account of her personal experiences in working with Hunter College to bring together faculty, counselors, staff, and students to develop a panel dealing institutionally with sexual harassment on campus. Helly's account takes us through the entire history of the panel including the time it took to create and the obstacles that had to be addressed. She also writes about the issues of educating the panel to educate the community, and the types of cases with which the panel dealt. Helly realizes, that while the idea and purpose of the panel are important, additional forms of education and advocacy are needed: an available counseling system and "absolute reliable support of higher administration" (1996, p. 276). Finally, in order for a program like this to succeed, a well-planned education system is needed to inform all faculty, staff, and students of the issues involved in sexual harassment.

Dziech and Hawkins (1998) believe that in order to prevent and provide awareness of sexual harassment, a university needs to make sexual harassment awareness part of their mission. Throughout sections of their book, Dziech and Hawkins identify ideas and problems universities have in reinforcing the importance of sexual harassment education. The authors do point out there are many obstacles for universities in implementing ideas: size, culture, curriculum, internal structure, and so forth. The authors also acknowledge the fact that students should be the main concern for a university. By giving examples of how universities have utilized their students in developing sexual harassment awareness, the authors illustrate how more than just a small group of administrators can solve problems.

Dziech and Hawkins (1998) also address the idea of counselor education. The authors believe that campuses should have trained advocates for victims of harassment, but they also must provide trained professionals. While advocates are an essential part of sexual harassment training and awareness, trained professionals need to be in place for certain circumstances. Institutions that do not employ advocates and trained professionals risk contributing to secondary victimization of those seeking help (p. 73).

It is important to rehabilitate the sexual harassers who remain in the workplace. Creating a rehabilitation program for harassers is the principle behind Salisbury and Jaffe's (1996) article. The authors' research and ideas are based on the experiences of trainers working on rehabilitating sexual harassers. The principle behind this idea is that most of the individuals who have committed minor forms sexual harassment need to be trained and educated about what is proper and improper conduct at work. The authors go through a step-by-step analysis of the process. The authors believe that by giving individual training, the organization gives its employees the support to change (p. 151).

### *Racial/Ethnic Harassment*

Much of the education regarding sexual harassment prevention can also be used in terms of racial/ethnic harassment prevention. However, there are some additional concepts that need to be addressed. Schools often celebrate diversity, but while these celebrations often typically highlight cultural differences, they rarely discuss issues related to oppression, racism, or harassment. Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) identify five tools that can be employed by institutions of higher education to facilitate discussions on these topics. The first is to realize that we all have racial stereotypes, which determine our feelings about and our actions

towards those of other races. Because attitudes and behaviors are linked, it is important to facilitate changes in attitudes. Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) recommend developing ways to create favorable contact between groups. Such things as conferences, activities, or discussion groups are good ways to begin to get people interacting.

The second observation that educational facilities must make is to realize that many textbooks perpetuate racial stereotypes. Educators need to review textbooks and identify those that highlight positive aspects of individuals of all racial and ethnic backgrounds. Books that “shade in” characters are not enough. If the books that educators are given do not promote multicultural education, the educators need to develop or find outside sources. Guest speakers, pamphlets, or additional literature are ways to incorporate racial understanding into the classroom.

Third, Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) believe that “the nature of prejudice and racism should be taught at all educational levels” (p. 95). Individuals, as well as the school systems, must understand that institutions of education are both a source and reinforcer of racial attitudes and beliefs. The longer that individuals are exposed to racial stereotypes without having awareness brought to their attention, the harder it will be to break the cycle of racism, oppression, and harassment.

The fourth tool identified by Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) is this: Issues of prejudice, racism, and minority interests need to become an integral part of the curriculum.

Unfortunately these are issues that may be briefly touched on, but not studied. Attitudes and behaviors are constantly shaped by an individual’s academic experience. By continually incorporating issues of harassment, prejudice, and multicultural interests, students become



aware of problems and can help create strategies of change, instead of continuing the cycle of oppression.

Finally, Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) say that since we can define racism and we can see how it affects our attitudes, we should assume that racism does exist and see if an end can be put to it. If people do not believe that racism exists, they will not believe in the issues associated with it, namely racial/ethnic harassment. As long as people believe that racism, discrimination, and oppression are now history, the current problems that we have with issues of harassment will not go away. The question now becomes how do we make people aware of the problem of sexual and racial/ethnic harassment?

### *Creating a Training Program*

Because training dealing with issues of race, ethnicity, and gender is often considered diversity education, for the purpose of this section, sexual/racial/ethnic harassment programs will be considered part of a diversity training initiative. The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM, 2000) identifies several guidelines that an organization must keep in mind when considering and planning diversity training. The first guideline is to determine the organization's training objective(s). It is important for organizations to formulate concise objectives when deciding to implement a diversity-training program. Wheeler (1994) identifies two levels of objectives for diversity training: macro and micro (p. 18). At the micro-level diversity training addresses specific skills, knowledge or behavior. The macro-level focuses on the organization's bottom line. Its objectives include culture change, greater employee retention, and improved productivity. When formulating the organization's objectives, it is important to consider the corporate culture, specific work force issues, the

structure of the organization and the organization's experience in the diversity field (Wheeler, 1994).

SHRM's second guideline is for the organization to define diversity. An organization may have a broad definition of diversity encompassing everything from race, class, and gender to religion, education and disability, or depending on the size and organizational makeup, they may have a narrower definition of diversity. Mobley and Payne (1992) argue that, from the standpoint of the organization, a more inclusive definition of diversity acknowledges the multitude of differences that affect human interaction at work. Just as a narrow definition of diversity could cause the training to focus too much attention on certain individuals, too broad a definition might cause lack of attention on the "real" issues. "What is crucial for any definition of diversity is that an organization's employees and customers see themselves in the definition (SHRM, 2000, p. 2).

SHRM's third guideline is to have a broad diversity strategy. Diversity training is just a small part of the overall diversity strategy. Upper levels of management must support and create a diversity-friendly organization. Management must also practice what they preach. A supportive corporate culture demonstrates an ongoing commitment to continuous learning (Velasquez, 1998). According to several authors (Mobley and Payne, 1992; Overmyer Day, 1995; and Velasquez, 1998), diversity training must also have a senior level champion.

Just like other training programs, it is important for management to do a needs assessment of the organization. The main objective of training is to improve both the individual and the organization (Blanchard and Thacker, 1998). A needs assessment is a systematic method for determining what an organization needs to do to bring about

improvement. According to Pace, Smith, and Mills (1991) “A needs analyst gathers information from organization members about organization tasks, the organizational system, and other productivity related options in order to determine whether problems exist” (pg. 69).

SHRM’s forth guideline is to make sure the initiative is well planned. Once the organization has decided on their diversity needs, they need to begin planning how they will implement their training. It is important that training does not start prematurely or as a response to a diversity incident. The top-level management must provide clear communication about training to ensure all levels of employment understand why the organization is implementing this training. Management must also explain how diversity training can benefit both the organization and the individual. It is important for individuals to understand why diversity is an issue within the organization (Wheeler, 1994). Although many managers tend to be wary of employee surveys or focus groups, it is important for them to conduct some type of formal audit of the organization’s culture (Thomas, 1994). By doing this, an organization may learn of different issues it had not previously considered, it may give some type of clue as to where are the concerns of the employees, and it may help bring about trainer awareness of “problem” areas.

The fifth guideline to consider is the development of the training program. Whether the training is done in-house or by an outside consultant, the development process of the training program is one of the toughest jobs. Velasquez (1998) says that too often “rescue diversity training” has to be done in order to clean up the mess that old school trainers are making. He points out that when designing a training program, there are several changes that need to be made to avoid old school training mistakes. In the past, training often employed

confrontational or “in your face” techniques, was centered around and led solely by the “expert,” used discussions that were awareness or theory based, used negative examples and role playing, was “canned,” discussed victims and rights, and was reactive. According to Velasquez (1998), today’s training needs to be non-confrontational and participant-centered with a facilitator that leads and follows. It needs to also be driven by practical or “real world” examples, use positive examples, be customized to the organization, allow discussions related to shared responsibility, and be proactive.

SHRM’s sixth guideline when planning a diversity-training program is careful selection of the trainer. Even the best-designed training program will fail with a poor trainer. Since there are currently no guidelines or standardized training for diversity programs, choosing a qualified trainer may be difficult. According to Wheeler (1994), there are several things to consider when seeking an outside consultant to handle the diversity training. First, one should make sure to conduct a screening process of consulting organizations. Next, one should ensure that the individual(s) have a background of diversity training with an emphasis on the business culture. Finally, one should make sure to check references and talk to other companies about results. A good diversity consultant should assess the organizational culture, be able to respond proactively to resistance and acknowledge differences, and show the value of sameness.

Once one has developed the training program and secured the trainer there are just a few more things that need to be done. The first thing is to make sure one tests the training thoroughly before rolling it out. As with other training programs, it is advisable to do a test run and a pilot test before incorporating it into the training curriculum. Once the diversity

training is incorporated, one should remember the importance of feedback and evaluation to the program. Feedback and evaluations will alert the trainer to concerns within the program. No matter how successful the training seems to be, always follow-up.

### *Web-based Training*

As technology has changed and advanced, so have methods of training. Currently, technology based training runs the gamut from film, to computer delivered training to web-based training programs. Driscoll (1997) breaks down web-based training into two categories: text-only and multimedia. Text only includes e-mail, bulletin boards, and software downloading. While the popularity of these types of training are now declining, each still serves an important function. Driscoll identifies text-only e-mail as the equivalent to the correspondence course. The e-mail account can be used to communicate between the instructor and student, as well as be used to set up discussion groups. Text-only bulletin boards enable students to post opinions, questions, and comments to their various newsgroups. In order for students to use these systems students must log-on to participate. The students' discussions can be monitored and organized by the facilitator. Software downloading is a way that the facilitator can provide material to the students. This type of training may require students to have specific operating systems or computer programs that will allow them to download the information. Clark and Lyons (1999) also identify this type of text and graphics training, which they believe is good for reference, receptive training, and tours of web sites. This type of training is devoid of audio, video, and interactions and is primarily used just to present information.

Driscoll's (1997) second category of web-based training is multimedia, which she breaks down into four parts. Web computer-based training lets "learners engage in self-paced learning programs that use multimedia to communicate content" (p. 7). These programs may include hypertext, images, audio, video, and animation. This type of computer-based training can be set up to have two-way asynchronous communication. However, many organizations are more interested in savings produced by Web programs than their education capabilities. In order to save costs or to assist individuals with less advanced computers, organizations may "dumb down" their programs.

Web-based employee performance support systems (EPSS) are a second category of Driscoll's (1997) web-based training. These programs "are best suited to provide practical knowledge and problem-solving skills" (1997, p. 8). Through the EPSS programs, individuals can access information that provides step-by-step instructions for various procedures. These programs can be accessed worldwide and the learners can access them "just in time," which helps them to get the information they need immediately. These programs can be regularly updated, which ensures employees have the most current information.

Similarly, Clark and Lyons (1999) discuss training using text, graphics and judged interactions from simple to complex. They say this type of training can be used for judged interactions that are set up as true-false/multiple choice question with feedback linked to the response. They also identify multimedia training with no judged interactions, which is good for reference, marketing, and receptive training. This type of instruction features sound, animation, and/or video and requires that the learner has a multimedia-capable computer.

The third category identified by Driscoll (1997) is asynchronous virtual classroom. This type of training blends a variety of web based training technologies. Communication is a key factor in this training. Asynchronous training programs require the participants to take on the roles of student and instructor. As such, participants must become active learners and take responsibility for their own learning. "The complexity and sophistication of the program is largely determined by the program's design and the learner's hardware limitations" (1997, p. 8). Clark and Lyons (1999) as discuss interactive multimedia from simple to complex, which is good for directive training and guided discovery training. This training adds interaction to the multimedia capabilities.

Fister (1998) interviews multiple individuals who develop and/or use web based training programs. Her article emphasizes that training can be done using only simple elements of text and design. More important than high-end media and flash "are basic instructional-design principles, such as planning the content around the needs of your audience, engaging learners with relevant information, and delivering on your course's objectives" (1998, p. 43). Through Fister's interviews, she also points out that animation can be annoying and video technology does not justify the cost. Additionally, web training should let individuals interact. Instead of actual training programs, many of the on-line training programs are no more than reference manuals. Fister points out that web-based training should give the learner the opportunity to share ideas, exchange information, and ask questions (p. 46).

### *Benefits of Web-based Training*

One of the biggest reasons for businesses and organizations to switch to some form of web-based training is the costs associated with traditional training programs. “In 1997 U.S. companies spent between \$55 and \$60 billion on all types of education and training, an increase of 18% over adjusted 1985 spending,” (Whalen and Wright, 2000, p. 1). Schriver and Giles (1999) reported that when Lockheed Martin Energy Systems converted to web-based training they saved over \$1.5 million dollars. These costs were saved in a variety of ways: no longer having to pay a trainer, employee loss time from traveling back and forth to training classes, and costs related to processing and handling training records.

Roberts (1998), reports that web-based training utilized by Day’s Inn saved the company over \$400,000 dollars. In an interview with the Bay Network, he reports that their director of education believes that by using web-based training the company can save about \$350 per person per day in travel and accommodations costs. In an assessment by Hall, editor of *Multimedia & Training Newsletter*, he reports that “There is about a 50-percent reduction in time and cost over classroom training” (cited from Roberts, 1998, p. 99).

Financial saving is not the only benefit of web-based training; employee convenience is another important factor (Roberts, 1998; Schriver and Giles, 1999; and Whalen and Wright, 2000). According to Schriver and Giles (1999), employees can complete training when it is most convenient to them or least disruptive to their office or work environment. Whalen and Wright (2000) believe that employee access can be increased because learners will no longer be limited to previous training schedules established by the training office.



Whalen and Wright (2000) also report there are quantitative benefits related to learning efficiency and retention: faster (by 60%) learning curve, higher (by 25-60%) content retention, greater (by 56%) learning gains, better (by 50-60%) consistency of learning, and faster (by 38-70%) training comprehension (p. xviii).

Being able to educate or train the members of your organization in ways that save money and are more convenient is very important. It is also important to remember that there is a huge difference between technical or practical skills and communicative skills. The benefits of web-based training are impressive; however, there are also drawbacks to using web-based training.

#### *Drawbacks of Web-Based Training*

Currently, there are many articles touting the benefits of web-based and on-line training programs. Some of these articles mention small, but solvable problems such as initial cost, developing or purchasing on-line training packages, technology problems caused by different operating systems, and assessing if the learning tasks are appropriate for the learner (Clark and Lyons, 1999; Ewing, 2000; and Fister, 1998). The one factor that the literature on web-based and on-line training fails to point out is that there is a difference between behavior and skills based training.

Many times, web-based training and on-line learning are referred to as interactive; however, the interaction is done between the user and the computer. Often, in cases of harassment, individuals lose their voice in the situation. This loss of voice is a result of not being able to address the situation with the offender or not knowing how to tell their supervisor about what happened. When prevention training is done on-line, there is again a

loss of voice. Not only does the victim not have the opportunity to share their experience with others during a training session, but those who harass do not have to be confronted directly or indirectly by those victims.

Similarly, there is the problem with the degree of interactivity found in on-line learning. The web, as well as other training programs, does not always support collaborative learning (Vogel and Klassen, 2001). “Many students, women in particular, benefit from and appreciate participatory, collaborative interactions in which teachers not only impart information, but also facilitate discussions that allow for knowledge creation during class interaction” (Kramarae, n.d). Often, victims of harassment need to know that they are not the only ones. It makes it much easier for victims or advocates of harassment prevention to speak out if they know there is a support network in place. The utilization of web-based training eliminates this support network.

Another problem identified by Young (1995) is a lack of richness in electronic communication technologies (ECTs). In his study he found that ECTs were effective in numerous ways; however, there were several factors that individuals identified in which face-to-face communication was preferred. These included when subjects needed to communicate complicated issues, when there was a need for instant feedback, when there was the need for people to be involved, and when there was conflict resolution and/or sensitive or contentious issues. To some extent, each of these issues can be tied to harassment prevention education.

According to Roberts (1998) there are several reasons why many HR departments are not quite ready to roll out the web-based training. One major concern is that the audience is not ready, especially in the area of leadership development (p. 104). Along with that is the

assumption that everyone is proficient with using a computer and has access to one. Another reason cited by Roberts is that automated training will put trainers out of business. Since harassment prevention training is linked to the training and development department, if web-based training does put trainers out of business, these issues will lack a institutional champion. Finally, Roberts acknowledges that getting instructional material converted to something you can use on the web is a big concern. Often organizations lack the ability to successfully convert traditional classroom methods to an effective web-based program.

Both group and on-line training programs have their advantages and disadvantages. However, the purpose of this study is not to identify which is better, but to understand the differences in each of these programs and how the implementation of these programs relates to the overall campus climate.

### **Summary of Literature Review**

The literature on sexual harassment, racial harassment, and web-based training is extensive. Because of this, information on harassment was limited to research specifically dealing with harassment in higher education. This chapter began by looking at resources which defined sexual and racial/ethnic harassment. Second, the literature focused on who is affected by sexual and racial harassment. This section focused on both national and Iowa State University statistics and determined that harassment is a prevalent problem that affects the victims, co-workers, friends, and families. Profiles of sexual and racial/ethnic harassers was the third topic examined. While power is the overwhelming result, there are many reasons that individuals harass, including: a presumption of gender, racial, or ethnic superiority; a defense mechanism against those believed to be taking jobs or opportunities

away; sexual insecurity or misinterpreting signals; and finally cultural or institutional norms that allow the behavior. The fourth topic was the effects of harassment. This section looked at how harassment affects identity, the individual, and the institution. It shows that harassment has negative and pervasive effects starting at the individual level and permeating through the entire academic community.

The fifth section discussed the factors that the university must consider when creating a harassment prevention policy. The policy serves a two-fold purpose of shielding the institution from lawsuits to effectively preventing the problem of harassment. Finally, the sixth section examined how institutions could provide harassment education and training. It began by looking at issues of gender and race and how these concepts are imbedded in everyday situations. Next, it looked at the steps needed to create a training program. Finally, it looked at issues related to web-based training.

The literature examined the all possible issues related to sexual and racial/ethnic harassment; as well as the issues related to creating a policy and program to help alleviate the problems associated with harassment. The literature demonstrates that harassment related issues on a university are prevalent and not easily resolved.

### **Statement of Purpose**

Campuses, such as Iowa State University, offer multiple learning opportunities for their faculty and staff in the areas of diversity, race, and gender. However, it is important to understand who is participating in these courses, why they are participating, and what are they gaining from these programs. The purpose of this research is to understand how a campus-wide harassment-prevention training program is implemented and what, if any, are

the outcomes of and differences in training methods, and the impact and effect of the program.

It is important to note that the previously cited work, as well as a multitude of other research, contends that campuses need harassment education. However, while the research addresses such topics as the problems associated with educating an entire campus and developing training programs for staff and students, there seems to be a lack of research dealing directly with the issue of educating faculty, administrators, and staff. The irony in this is that most of the research on sexual harassment on campus points to faculty, staff, and administrators as the harassers. Much information and research exists in the area of general harassment, but relatively little that has been done dealing directly with the effects of a staff and faculty wide training program on a university campus. Even though there is substantial research on how to develop web-based training, very little information exists that compares group training with web-based training. Because campus wide training on issues of diversity is relatively new, this research will be an important step in understanding the means by which a campus implements and conducts a university wide training program and evaluates the effectiveness of the program.

### **Theoretical Assumptions**

The research has been examined under the scope of Critical Theory. A combination of Jürgen Habermas' three major interests and Cheris Kramarae's work with muted group theory and technology and the Internet was used. Critical Theory was chosen because it aims to reveal the ways in which competing interests clash and the manner in which conflicts are resolved in favor of one group over another. Critical Theory states that there needs to be an

understanding of the lived experiences of people, and an examination of social conditions to uncover oppressive power arrangements and how messages reinforce oppression in society.

Critical Theory also attempts to fuse theory and action.

Habermas was selected based on his three major interests: work, interaction, and power. Through work, individuals make an effort to create material resources, and technology is used to accomplish practical results. Interaction is the use of language and symbols to communicate. There is a constant power struggle because social order leads to the distribution of power, yet individuals are interested in being freed from domination. The factors of work, interaction, and power all come into play when researching organizational harassment prevention training.

According to Habermas (1970), the university must be ever evolving: It must meet the needs of the economic world by producing qualified new generations of employees, be concerned with advancing and reproducing education, and it must transmit and produce technically exploitable knowledge (pp. 1-2). These are not the only responsibilities of the university. Habermas identifies three additional responsibilities of the university: extrafunctional abilities; communication skills; and political consciousness.

Not only is the university responsible for producing graduates with the functional abilities they need to be successful in the working world; it is also responsible for the extrafunctional abilities (Habermas, 1970, p. 2). "In this connection extrafunctional refers to all those attributes and attitudes relevant to the pursuit of a professional career that are not contained per se in professional knowledge and skills" (Habermas, 1970, p. 2). These are the leadership, interpersonal, and communicative skills that an individual needs to experience

and learn in order to succeed professionally and socially. Habermas believes that the university does not necessarily produce these virtues, but its socialization process should “be in harmony with them” (p. 2). When a university does not set a positive example, conflicts may arise.

The second responsibility identified by Habermas is for universities to “transmit, interpret, and develop the cultural tradition of the society” (1970, p. 2). Those in the higher administration, and the educators, are responsible for learning about and teaching about the cultures in our society. Because culture is so diverse, it is important to learn about the differences between individuals. It is important that information about cultural traditions in society are learned; however, the university needs to make sure that it is not reproducing, developing, or transforming tradition. In other words, the university needs to make sure that its teachings and actions do not reproduce negative assumptions about a culture, and it should tell the whole story about various cultures, not just one person’s version of others’ cultures and histories.

Thirdly, universities need to help form the political consciousness of its students (1970, p. 3). Habermas believes that lack of political attitudes and consciousness has significant political consequences. Individuals who remain silent about the issues that are important to them are essentially saying these issues are not important. By not encouraging students, staff, and faculty to become agents of change, universities perpetuate the hegemonic order of the campus and the community. Habermas strongly encourages communication between all individuals.

Of particular interest to this research is Habermas's belief in the ideal speech situation. He believes that the ideal speech situation requires freedom of speech without constraint. All individuals must have equal opportunities to speak, and the power dynamics may be distributed equally to all in society. If these requirements are met, emancipatory communication can take place.

Kramarae's (1981) work on Muted Group Theory is also relevant to this research and compliments Habermas' work. Kramarae's research is in the area of women and communication and explains how women (and minorities) are often silenced by the dominant element in society. The premise of Muted Group Theory is that language is culture bound. Because men traditionally have more power than women, they have more influence over language, which results in a male-biased language. This male bias allows men to create words and meanings in order to express their ideas. Women are left out of the meaning creation, and are therefore unable to express what is unique to them; hence, they are a muted group. The theory claims that if men allow women's experiences to be incorporated into the language, they risk losing their power.

There are three assumptions of Muted Group Theory. The first is that men and women perceive the world differently because they have different perceptions shaping their experiences. The second is that men enact their power politically, perpetuating their power, while suppressing women's ideas and meanings from gaining public acceptance. The third is that in order for women to participate in society, they must convert their unique ideas, experiences, and meaning into male language in order to be heard.



Muted Group Theory also identifies ways in which women are silenced. One way is through ridicule. When referring to “women’s talk,” often the words whining, nagging, gossiping are used, all of which have negative connotations. The second form of silencing comes from being ignored. Often women’s art, poetry, films, and so forth are ignored or deemed not worthy by the mainstream culture. Finally, men are “gatekeepers” of communication. Traditionally, men have made the decisions about what is to be included in history books, leaving women’s history excluded. Men also tend to interrupt more than women, to be more assertive, and to be able to change the topic of conversation to their interest.

Another area Kramarae studies is technology and the use of the Internet. She believes that the Internet reproduces patterns of inequality similar to those found in society. Because men are often associated with technology, she believes that faculty and students have been excluded from technology policy making. However, if technology is interactive, cyberspace and on-line learning has the potential to be a hospitable place for women.

Kramarae and Taylor (1993) identify four specific problems with Internet technology and electronic networks. The first is that men tend to monopolize the talk in most open networks (p. 55). The authors state that young men have more time to spend in front of their computers and historically men are more accustomed to talking in public conversations. Another issue is that women’s topics are rarely raised in mixed conversation groups, and if they are they are, seldom taken up by men (p. 55), so women may become less interested or feel that their issues are not important.

The second issue that Kramarae and Taylor (1993) discuss is the use of harassment on networks. Women may experience various forms of sexual harassment that are no longer permissible in the classroom setting. When women complain about their experiences, it may lead to hostile comments (p. 56). Women who are working to become respected scholars are often silenced by these hostile comments. This silencing has negative effects on the individual and the institution. Although, Kramarae and Taylor refer specifically to sexual harassment, the same issues of racial/ethnic harassment can be inferred.

The third issue Kramarae and Taylor identify is the climate of the net. Often men display more assertive behavior: they send more messages, introduce more topics, disagree more frequently, and often send “hot-tempered” messages (p. 56). These kinds of dominant behavior affect women’s participation.

Finally, Kramarae and Taylor point out is an increase in high-tech titillation (p. 56). The authors specifically address how this issue affects the university. Pornographic pictures, drawings, and photos are often found on public computers. Individuals have been known to walk into public offices or faculty and staff offices and find these types of images on the computer screen. Many female faculty, staff, and students often receive unrequested visuals over their e-mails and on public servers.

Kramarae and Taylor (1993) also offer eight suggestions to change “the structure of interaction on campuses” (p. 57). The first is women-only forums. This gives women the opportunity for interaction on issues which concern them, provides a safe forum, and provides inclusion for women. The second suggestion is to provide training for computer moderators to decide what is allowed on the net and to deal with issues regarding participant

disrespect. The third is to provide warnings to acknowledge that networks are not completely private or safe. The fourth is to provide a policy against and mechanism for harassment complaints. The fifth suggestion is to provide reports on the number and types of complaints. These reports could include assessment of the conversations, number and length of postings, and profiles of the subscribers and participants. The sixth suggestion is to provide clarification of what is considered offensive material and messages. The seventh suggestion is to provide explanation about who can create a network bulletin board and on what topics. Finally, they suggest providing discussion of the differing access to networks.

Since Iowa State University uses both face-to-face and computer mediated communication to present its harassment prevention training programs, it will be important to see how these methods affect the communication practices of faculty and staff. Does the training that the staff is given truly lead to a new understanding of issues or does it serve to segregate the powerful from the powerless in terms of harassment? Because the type of computer training that Iowa State University uses does not provide individual interactions, one might surmise that the online training silences the voices of those most at risk of harassment.

### **Justification of the Study**

Up to this point, the only research found comparing group training to on-line training has been in relation to hard skills. This research is a first step in looking at the differences between the two types of training in what can be considered as more communicative or inter-relational skills. This research is not to undermine the importance of web-based training, but

to take a critical look at how implementing this type of training in certain situations may serve to perpetuate the problem rather than facilitate the solution.

This research is taking steps in a new direction to begin looking at how individuals view the benefits and drawbacks of training, as opposed to how organizations view and analyze the benefits and drawbacks. Looking at how individuals perceive the two types of training is an important step in determining if the training objectives are truly being met. Because of the small number of interviews conducted and the limitations to one college, it is possible a more university wide project would yield different results. As such, there is no reason to believe the results of the small number of interviews could be generalized to all college and university campuses or departments across the country.

### **Research Questions**

The following questions will help guide this study:

**RQ1: What, if any, differences are there between on-line and in-group training?**

What is the demographic nature of participants in each program?

Do either training program promote interaction, questions, and comments?

**RQ2: What has been the impact of harassment prevention training at ISU?**

Have the rates of harassment increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

What type of follow-up is being done to assess the knowledge gained by this training program?

### 3.

## METHODOLOGY

### Methodological Considerations

The purpose of this study is to investigate the differences between in-group and on-line harassment prevention training in terms of how the training is conducted, who participates in the training sessions, how and why harassment training was implemented at Iowa State University, and the effect of harassment prevention training. The research focuses on the relationship between power and harassment prevention training methods, with the overall question “Do harassment prevention training methods educate or silence?”

The intent of this study is to evaluate the two types of training methods and to gain insight into who is participating in each type of training and why. Because this research focuses on individuals and their perceptions, as well as on statistical background information provided by the university, empirical research was chosen as the best method to conduct this research. Participants’ experiences will be evaluated based on their assessments of their particular training session and their own personal views of how this training fits into Iowa State University’s diversity initiative.

A questionnaire was developed and interviews were set up with employees who have participated in the Sexual/Ethnic/Racial Harassment Prevention training programs. The population for this study consisted of ISU staff and faculty employed at Iowa State University during the 2002 year. The sample consisted of 13 employees from the College of Education and was obtained by contacting colleges and departments through letters and e-mails to solicit volunteers to interview. Interviews with the developers of the ISU

Sexual/Racial/Ethnic prevention training program were conducted to understand the history of the sexual/racial/ethnic training programs. The following questions will help guide this study:

**RQ1: What, if any, differences are there between on-line and in-group training?**

What is the demographic nature of participants in each program?

Does either training program promote interaction, questions, and comments?

**RQ2: What has been the impact of harassment prevention training at ISU?**

Have the rates of harassment increased, decreased, or stayed the same?

What type of follow-up is being done to assess the knowledge gained by this training program?

### **The Setting**

Iowa State University is located in Ames, Iowa, a town of approximately 50,000 people, including Iowa State University students. One of the oldest land-grant universities, Iowa State University opened in 1868. Iowa State University is governed by the Board of Regents of the State of Iowa. Directly under the Board of Regents is the university president, who oversees several vice presidents, the provost, several vice provosts, and directors of various institutes, the library, and the academic information technology office. The university is organized into nine colleges: College of Agriculture, College of Business, College of Design, College of Education, College of Engineering, College of Family and Consumer Sciences, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, College of Veterinary Medicine, and the Graduate College.

#### *Demography and Classification Systems of Iowa State University Employees*

Iowa State University employs 5,940 individuals (not including student employees).

These employees fall into one of three categories: faculty, professional and scientific or

contract, and merit. Both regular and adjunct faculty members are those at the rank of lecturer or higher, or those in administrative positions who carry academic rank. According to the Human Resource Office's website at Iowa State University, the Professional and Scientific and Merit classification systems are defined as follows:

Professional and Scientific (P&S) positions are designated as exempt under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Employees are exempt from overtime pay provisions. Duties performed by this group include administration, research, extension, and professional services.

Organized Merit positions in the Blue Collar, Clerical, Security and Technical bargaining units are covered under the provisions of the master contract negotiated between the State of Iowa and AFSCME. This position is covered by the provisions of the State Board of Regents Merit System Rules. Both organized and non-organized board of regents merit employees may apply and compete for this position as promotion, demotion, or transfer applicants. Merit System rules on pay on promotion, demotion, and transfer apply. All Merit positions are considered non-exempt staff and eligible for overtime as provided by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Professional and Scientific system is made up of positions such as academic advisor, director, accountant, manager, program coordinator, research assistant, or human resource specialist. In the Merit system, employees are put into one of four categories: blue collar, clerical, security, and technical. Within these categories there are subdivisions. For example, blue collar workers are animal caretakers, custodians, groundskeepers, and maintenance workers; clerical workers are cashiers, data entry operators, parking attendants,

and secretaries; security workers are the public safety enforcers, parking officers, and security guards; and technical workers are broadcast technicians, clinical technicians, photo specialists, and school assistants.

According to the 2002-2003 ISU Fact Book, of the 5,940 non-student employees at Iowa State University 1,736 are faculty, 2,292 are Professional and Scientific or contract and 1,912 are Merit. At first look, Iowa State University appears to be extremely gender balanced with 2,942 female employees and 2,998 male employees. While the gender balance of the professional and scientific positions are roughly equal – 49.6% female and 50.4% male, the gender balance of the faculty and merit positions are quite skewed. Only 30.7% of the entire faculty is composed of women, however, the merit positions are composed of 67.3% women.

---

Table 1

Iowa State University faculty, staff, and students by gender and race/ethnicity

---

	Total	Male	Female	White	African American	American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Inter- national
Students	27,898	56.0%	44.0%	83.8%	2.7%	.3%	2.5%	1.8%	9.2%
P&S	2,292	50.4%	49.6%	92.3%	2.2%	.3%	4.0%	1.2%	
Merit	1,912	33.7%	67.3%	96%	1.2%	.3%	1.6%	.9%	
Faculty	1,736	69.3%	30.7%	84.9%	1.6%	.7%	10.8%	1.9%	

---

Information provided by Iowa State University Fact Book 2002

There are some additional differences between the Professional and Scientific positions and the Merit positions. Jobs listed in the Professional and Scientific system are open for anyone within or outside the university to apply. Applications are reviewed, interviews are given, and references are checked prior to hiring a new employee. The pay



scale for each position is set up with a minimum and maximum salary range, which allows the employer and potential employee the ability to negotiate salary based on the potential employee's skills. Once hired into the Professional and Scientific system, an employee is evaluated on a yearly basis to review their successes and to award a raise consistent with the evaluation. It is important to note often, a Professional and Scientific employee's pay increases are dependent upon the department's financial situation. Employees in departments with lower financial security may not be given equivalent raises to those in departments with more financial security. If a current Professional and Scientific employee chooses to seek another job, he or she simply sends an application to the potential employer, and the process starts again for them.

In order to be hired in the Merit system, an individual must first take a test and fill out substantial paperwork to establish what his or her skills are and how he or she would best fit into the system. Once the test and paperwork are completed, the potential employee is essentially graded. Once a vacancy opens up, it is first offered to any current Merit employees. If current employees are interested, they have the opportunity to meet with the employer; however, the position is not filled by the person who is most qualified, it is filled by the person with the most seniority. If no one transfers into the position, the names of the top individuals who qualify for the position are sent to the potential employer. The employer then conducts an interview with the top three or four candidates to select the new employee. Once an individual is hired and successfully makes it through the probation period, he or she becomes a Merit employee.

The benefits of being employed in the Merit system, such as seniority, representation by the union, consistent pay increases, and pay or time off for overtime, are balanced by some definite drawbacks. Every employee is evaluated on a yearly basis and given an automatic pay increase established by the Board of Regents. This is a mandated and consistent increase no matter how good or bad the review. If an employee excels in a position, he or she cannot be rewarded with an additional increase or promotion. An employer has the option of reclassifying the position, but it is based on the job description, not on the employee's performance.

Women and minority employees who hold jobs in the Merit system, find that jobs as clerk, secretary, maintenance, or security are often stereotyped and viewed as less challenging or "bottom rung" jobs. The lack of power within these jobs may make female employees more prone to harassment and less likely to report it because they would be reporting it to their male superiors.

#### *Harassment Prevention Training*

According to the Human Resource Office, all employees hired at Iowa State University, including graduate assistants, are to participate in orientation and acclimation sessions. According to the Human Resource Office website, the orientation process includes a discussion of benefits, services, and the history of the university. "The acclimation session covers a variety of university policies and legal requirements in such areas as sexual or racial harassment, conflict of interest, computer ethics, and a drug free workplace" (ISU Human Resources website). The orientation and acclimation process is held seven times a year and

individuals can sign up for the sessions through AccessPlus, an employee and student website, or by contacting the training and development department.

Although individuals are required to participate in these training programs, the calls and e-mails that I have made to the training and development office regarding the specific requirements have not been returned. In my personal experience, when I started as a staff person at the University, I received letters that followed-up with me until I registered and participated in these programs. However, newer hires have told me that they were given the information and told they should participate, but there was no follow-up verifying that they had done so. Because of the lack of response I have received from the training and development office, I am inclined to think that participating in the orientation and acclimation are not considered much of a priority.

This leads to the question of how well the harassment prevention training program is monitored. According the Human Resources Office, all individuals are to participate in harassment prevention training; however, it is their choice to do it in a group setting or to complete it on-line. When asked how this was tracked, Human Resources explained that if an individual does it on-line, a report is generated that can be added to an individual's personnel file. When an individual participates in a group training session, she/he registers or checks in upon arrival; this information is then put into her o his personnel file. In trying to discover how the department handles those who had not participated, the Human Resource representative explained that when it is noticed that an employee or employees had not participated in training, an e-mail is sent to the department chair. It is the department chairs responsibility to make sure that each of their employees participates. In turn, the department

chair notifies the employee that she/he needs to participate in training. However, from my understanding, each time it is passed off, it becomes someone else's responsibility. What happens then is that the noncompliant employee starts the cycle all over again, with little or no consequences to the employee.

Although it is understandable that the Human Resources Office can not directly be responsible for everyone at the university, it seems somewhat irresponsible not to track this information and not to set up consequences for the noncompliant. The current system implies that harassment prevention is not really a priority unless each individual makes it one. By not enforcing participation, it could easily be said that harassment is not an important issue.

### **Selection and Description of Participants**

Instead of trying to focus on the campus as a whole, I decided it would be more appropriate to work specifically with one college. The College of Education was chosen as the sample population for several reasons. First, the college is consistent with the university in terms of gender and racial demographics. Second, the dean of the college is a strong supporter of diversity initiatives at the university and continues to serve on the President's Committee on Diversity Matters. Finally, the College of Education was chosen because it has a recent history of a sexual harassment case that resulted in a faculty member losing his job. Because of these issues, the assumption was made that the college would be a strong supporter of ensuring that its faculty and staff would have participated in harassment prevention training.

Prior to beginning my research, I met with the dean of the College of Education to explain my research project and to determine if he would object to me interviewing his staff

about such a sensitive issue. The dean thought it was an interesting project and allowed me to use his name in the letters that would be sent to solicit participants. He also directed his staff to provide me with a current list of all faculty, staff, and graduate assistants, from which I could obtain as contact information. The dean also explained to me how he inherited this harassment case when he accepted his current position. Most individuals would not consider stepping into a job during a high profile harassment case. The dean and his staff have been very helpful in providing me with information during this research.

The best way to solicit participants was by writing them and asking them if they would be willing to be interviewed about their experience with either on-line or group harassment prevention training. Originally, Iowa State University's Human Resource Office was contacted to see if they would provide me a list of individuals within the College of Education who had participated on-line and those who had participated in group training. Even though harassment prevention training is something that all staff is required to complete, the Human Resource department told me that this information is confidential and it would be up to the College of Education to provide a list of all their staff.

The dean's office provided a list of names, and because the dean was allowing me to use his name, he requested to review the letter prior to sending it out. Seven interviews were conducted. One participant chose to participate by completing a questionnaire and returning it to me via e-mail. Individuals who chose not to participate cited the following reasons: they had either changed their mind (they did not understand they had to have participated in training), were unable to find a time that would work with their schedule, or just did not return the calls or e-mails.

In total, I sent out 298 letters to faculty, staff, and graduate assistants inviting individuals to participate in my research. I followed-up the letters with e-mails to the same list (I did delete the names of those who had already participated) and an additional 20 that were sent to the graduate student organization. This produced an addition six participants.

---

Table 2

Breakdown of participants by gender, age, race, and type of training

---

	Male	Female	Mean Age	White	African American	On-line	Group
Faculty	3	2	48.6	5	0	2	3
P&S Staff	0	4	40.5	4	0	1	3
Graduate Assistants	2	1	43	1	2	1	2
Administrators	1	0	52	0	1	0	1
Total (13)	6	7	45.1	10	3	4	9

---

Thirteen individuals participated: seven females and six males, 10 individuals who identified themselves as white and three who identified themselves as African American, and four who participated on-line and nine who participated in group training. My sample included five faculty members, four professional and scientific members, three students, and one administrator. I was unable to obtain any representatives from the Merit staff or any international faculty, staff, or students.

## **Method**

### *Data Collection*

Interviews with 12 participants and one e-mail response were the primary sources of data for this research. Each participant was interviewed once. The interviewing process lasted from 25 to 90 minutes. All of the interviews were taped and transcribed. The majority of the interviews were conducted in the participants' offices, with the exception of two of the students. For these two students, I obtained a conference room away from their offices or departments upon their request.

Additional information was gathered by meetings, phone calls, and e-mails with the dean of the College of Education, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity, the Human Resource Department, and the Department of Public Safety. Iowa State University websites were also accessed to find background information, statistical information, and to obtain all public information regarding harassment prevention policies and what one needs to do to report an incident of harassment.

### *Data Analysis*

Two major themes began to emerge from the data: reasons to participate in training, including why each person selected their specific training method and differences between the training programs. The first theme, reasons to participate in training, was divided up into two categories: reasons why employees should participate in training and reasons why the participants chose to participate in training. Included in this are the gender and racial differences in participation choices.

The second theme that emerged, differences between the training programs was first divided into group training and on-line training. Each of those categories was further divided into three categories: benefits, drawbacks, and ways to improve training. Again, gender and racial differences were analyzed within this context.

Information on my second research question, addressing the impact of harassment training, was obtained through interviews regarding their perceptions of how they felt this training program fit into the campus climate and statistics provided by the Human Resource Department and the Department of Public Safety. The Department of Public Safety provided me with the statistics they had computerized from 2000 to present and also allowed me access to their files to obtain older information.

### **Summary**

In preparing for this research, I participated in both group training and on-line training to ensure that I understood the full scope of how each of the training programs were conducted. Based on my experiences with each training session and possibly on my gender, I did find that I had an opinion about which method I thought was better. However, when conducting the interviews, I always tried to remain unbiased and to remember that the interviews were about the participants' experiences and not mine.

This chapter looked at the methodology used in preparing for and conducting this research. It seems on the surface that diversity issues, including harassment prevention, are a priority at the university. However, as I began to do my research I, found that the more I tried to access specifics about harassment prevention training the less information people were willing to discuss. I do realize that information must filter through many levels of



bureaucracy to get from the president down to the staff. But if harassment prevention was truly an important issue, I believe that greater steps would be taken to ensure compliance with the issue of harassment prevention training. In the next chapter, I will allow the participants of this study to have their own voice in discussing harassment prevention training.

## 4.

**PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS**

In this chapter, the findings of the study are presented and described. The main source of these findings consists of interviews with individuals who participated in group or on-line training. Additional information was also obtained by correspondence with the Human Resource Office and through research done at the Department of Public Safety.

**Research Question 1 – What differences are there between on-line and group training?**

One of the key interests in this research project was to look at the differences between group and on-line training. Of particular interest was who was participating in each type of training and if either training program promoted interaction, questions, and comments. Additionally, information was to be gathered to find out how the individuals evaluated their group training in terms of benefits, drawbacks, and ways to improve the training program. First, I will provide a breakdown of who participated in each type of training. Next, I will look at the benefits, drawbacks, and ways to improve group training. Finally, I will focus on the benefits, drawbacks, and ways to improve on-line training.

**Group Training***Participants*

Nine of the 13 individuals (69%) participated in group training. Of these, three were male and six were female; seven were white and two were African American; and four were faculty, three were P&S employees, and two were students. Of the three males, one was an African American faculty/administrator, one was a white faculty member, and one was a

white student. Of the six females, two were white faculty members, three were white P&S employees, and one was an African American student.

### *Benefits*

The nine individuals who participated in group training cited 44 benefits of participating in group training. These 44 responses were broken down into six categories: learning from others, good trainers, education and/or awareness of issues, interaction, good climate, and other.

Table 3

#### Benefits of group training

		Learning from others	Education Awareness	Interaction	Good Trainers	Climate	Other
Total Response	n=9	89%	78%	67%	56%	33%	11%
Male	n=3	67%	33%	67%	67%	33%	0%
Female	n=6	100%	100%	67%	50%	33%	17%
Faculty/Administrator	n=4	75%	50%	50%	50%	25%	0%
P&S Staff	n=3	100%	100%	67%	33%	33%	33%
Student	n=2	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%	0%
White	n=7	86%	86%	57%	43%	14%	14%
African American	n=2	100%	50%	100%	100%	100%	0%

Break down of benefits of group training by gender, employment, and race

Learning from others was the most frequently cited benefit of participating in group training with eight of the nine participants (89%). Learning from others included such

responses such as: hearing differences in perceptions, learning diverse vantage points, and hearing others people's experience. The only individual who did not cite learning from others was the white male faculty who was not interviewed.

The second category that elicited the most response was education and awareness. This category included such comments as more in depth learning, raising people's awareness about various issues, and better understanding of policies and procedures. Again, seven of the nine participants (78%) referenced either education or awareness as a benefit of training. The only two who did not specifically reference it were the white male faculty member and the African American male faculty member. It is important to note at least two possible reasons that someone might not mention education and awareness as a benefit. First, the underlying assumption is that training is an educational tool, therefore the individuals may not have thought they needed to specify education in their response. Second, participants may not feel that they were made any more aware or gained any educational benefit from the training. For example, the white male faculty said that he learned; however, he continued his comment by adding that it was "because he was smart." He did not credit the training.

The third category is interaction. Six of the nine participants (67%) stated that interaction was an important part of group training. The category of interaction was separate from learning from others in that individuals specifically interacted with others, as opposed to just sharing knowledge and experience. Examples of interaction include: providing opportunities for networking within and between departments, the trainers working with individuals, and the trainers providing exercises for the participants. Those who indicated

interaction included: the African American female and white male student, two white female P&S employees, a white female faculty, and an African American male faculty/administrator.

The fourth category referenced good trainers. Five of the nine (56%) participants specifically referenced the trainer(s) of their group session. Those who referenced the trainers were the two students, one white female P&S employee, and one white female faculty, and one African American male faculty/administrator. These responses included comments such as: “they spoke to us as educators and as people,” “they were sensitive to the needs of the audience,” and “they were well prepared.”

The fifth category was a positive climate. Three of the nine participants (33%) indicated that the climate was a benefit of group training. The climate was credited for facilitating good discussion by several participants: the African American female student, African American male faculty/administrator, and by one of the white, female P&S employees.

The final category, other, included one response that the participant liked the fact that the training was a one-day session. She felt that it was a benefit that it could all be scheduled during one day because that way she could focus her attention on it as opposed to the things she had to do before or after the training.

### *Drawbacks*

Almost always accompanying the benefits of something are the drawbacks; however, there were substantially fewer responses citing drawbacks than there were identifying benefits. The nine individuals who participated cited 19 drawbacks of participating in group

training. These drawbacks were broken down into three categories: participant problems, programmatic/time related problems, and trainer problems.

The most significant problem had to do with participants in the group training. Seven of the nine participants (78%) stated definite problems resulted from some of the actions and comments made by other participants. These included: individuals talking or snickering during the training, individuals trying to “hijack” the training with inappropriate questions or comments, and participants who clearly did not want to be there. All of the female participants and the one male student cited problems during their training. The only two who did not reference problems with other individuals were the white, male faculty member and the African American, male faculty/administrator.

---

Table 4

Drawbacks of group training

		Participant problems	Programmatic problems	Trainer problems
Total Response	n=9	78%	44%	22%
Male	n=3	67%	0%	33%
Female	n=6	100%	67%	17%
Faculty/Administrator	n=4	75%	50%	50%
P&S Staff	n=3	100%	67%	0%
Student	n=2	100%	0%	0%
White	n=7	86%	43%	23%
African American	n=2	50%	50%	0%

---

Break down of drawbacks of group training by gender, employment, and race.

The second drawback had to do with programmatic/time related problems. This included such things as: certain topics not covered, too lengthy, and no follow-up. Four of the nine participants (44%) cited these types of problems. These problems were cited only by females, two P&S and two faculty members.

The third drawback related to problems with the trainer. Two individuals (22%), one male and one female, white faculty members, specifically stated problems with the trainer during their session. One of them believed the trainer came across as hostile. The other stated that, as a group, their department participated in an in-house training session, during which one of the training and development films was shown, but no trainer was present and no guidance was given in how to work through the training.

#### *Ways to improve*

Although those who participated in group training cited very few drawbacks, they did have multiple ideas on how to improve group training. A total of 27 responses dealt with how training could be improved. These suggestions were broken down into five categories: mandatory training with follow up, head-on learning (learning more direct information about the university and specific cases of harassment and how they were handled), format changes, changes in trainers, and practical application.

Five out of nine participants (56%) stated that the training needs to be mandatory and there needs to be some type of follow-up training or refresher information developed. Many of the individuals felt like they were trained once and forgotten about or that they were not made aware of new policies or issues in a timely manner.

A second change that individuals would make would be in the format of the training. Four of the nine participants (44%) suggested various changes including various levels of training, shortening it or breaking it up differently, or even making sure that there is a good diverse mix in the training group.

A third important change the participants would make would be to have more “head-on learning.” Two of the nine participants (22%) stated that they wanted more practical knowledge and wanted to know what was currently going on at the university, including statistics or utilizing current “scandals” to make people aware of why certain things are an issue.

A fourth change included making some changes with the trainers. Two of the nine participants (22%), both white, female faculty suggested having more diverse trainers and making sure those trainers are aware of specific issues facing their particular departments. While they believed that it is good to review policies and procedures, they also stated that some departments have more physical types of contact with students than others, such as music, dance, and athletics, and this is a big issue in relation to harassment.

A fifth and final change simply included teaching faculty practical ways to use this type of training in the classroom. One faculty member specifically wanted to know how she could apply some of this knowledge to the particular courses that she taught. She thought it would be nice if upper level administrators were more aware of what was going on in the classrooms.

Even though these participants participated, and for the most part had a good group training session, eight of the nine participants (89%) specifically stated that on-line training



did serve some positive purposes. Several of them thought it was a good reference if they had questions, others thought it should become a requirement before group training, and some said that on-line training may be beneficial to particular learning styles. However, none of them thought that the on-line training should be the only method of harassment prevention training. This leads to the discussion of on-line training.

### **On-line Training**

#### *Benefits*

Just as there are benefits of group training, there are also benefits of on-line training. The four participants who completed their training on-line came up with five benefits of on-line training: accessibility/convenience, learning at one's own pace, learning styles, educational awareness, and program interaction. The most common response made by all four participants is that on-line training was easily accessible and more convenient than group training. All the participants thought that being able to do the training at your own desk or on your own time was a very desirable feature.

The next most common benefits cited were being able to proceed at one's own pace, more appropriate to various learning styles, and educational awareness. Each of these categories had a 75% response rate. All but one of the faculty members stated that self-paced participation was a benefit. Three of the four on-line participants cited seven different ideas related to learning styles, including: processing the material more quickly by using text and visual mechanisms, cover material more quickly than if you were in a group, and group discussions are not always helpful. The only person who did not cite learning styles was the

African American male student. Both faculty members and the P&S staff stated that on-line learning promoted awareness of the problem of harassment and the various policies that Iowa State University implements.

The final benefit cited by two of the participants (50%), one white, male faculty and one white, female P&S staff, was the interaction within the on-line training. They both cited the quiz function as beneficial and said that if you wanted additional information there were various links you could refer to or you were able to quickly contact the human resources department through e-mail if you had a questions. Neither of the two participants who cited the e-mail option had used it, therefore they were unsure how effective it really was.

---

Table 5

Benefits of on-line training

---

		Accessibility/ Convenience	Own pace	Learning styles	Educational awareness	Program interaction
Total Response	n=4	100%	75%	75%	75%	50%
Male	n=3	100%	75%	67%	67%	33%
Female	n=1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Faculty/Administrator	n=2	100%	50%	100%	100%	50%
P&S Staff	n=1	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Student	n=1	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%
White	n=3	100%	67%	100%	100%	67%
African American	n=1	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%

---

Break down of benefits of on-line training by gender, employment, and race.

### *Drawbacks*

On-line training is not perfect and of course several drawbacks were identified by the participants. Three major drawbacks were identified by the participants: issues of seriousness by the participant/ISU, lack of interaction, and programmatic problems. The first draw back cited by one white male faculty and one white female P&S (50%) had to do with issues of seriousness of the participant. Both of these individuals were concerned that individuals would only skim the material and not try to learn it, and that the material would not be taken seriously. They also had concerns about how seriously the training was treated by the Human Resources Office.

---

Table 6

Drawbacks of on-line training

---

		Participant seriousness	No interaction	Programmatic problems
Total Response	n=4	50%	50%	25%
Male	n=3	33%	33%	33%
Female	n=1	100%	100%	0%
Faculty/Administrator	n=2	50%	0%	50%
P&S Staff	n=1	100%	100%	0%
Student	n=1	0%	100%	0%
White	n=3	67%	33%	33%
African American	n=1	0%	100%	0%

---

Break down of drawbacks of on-line training by gender, employment, and race.

The second drawback that 50% of participants identified was the lack of interaction. Both the white, female P&S employee and the African American, male student were concerned that the program did not really provide an effective method to ask questions or to learn from others.

The final drawback concerned some programmatic problems. One white male faculty member had some concerns with some of the wording used. He thought that some of the terms were too vague and needed better descriptions. Additionally, he felt that the program became a bit repetitive at times.

#### *Ways to improve on-line training*

Those who participated in on-line training had several suggestions on how to improve the training, these included: making it mandatory and providing follow-up, providing “head-on learning,” improving language use, and testing and grading. Similar to the suggestions of group training, the most common improvement cited by a white, female P&S and a white, male faculty member (50%) was to make sure that the training was mandatory and to provide for follow-up training.

The remaining responses were each reported by 25% of the participants. Again, similar to the group training “head-on learning” was another way to improve training. Participants were very interested in hearing more specifics about harassment issues as they relate to Iowa State University, not just generic information. This was suggested by the white, female P&S staff member. Another suggestion made by the white, female P&S staff member was to implement a testing and grading system. Those who do not successfully pass the

training, would need to go through an additional mechanism for training. Finally, one white, male faculty member suggested improving the language used in the training program.

As you can see, there are benefits and drawbacks to both training programs. Most significant were the similarities in improvements that the participants would like to have made to the training programs. Participants were concerned that harassment prevention training is not made mandatory and that there is not a good mechanism for follow-up. Additionally, the participants also seem to be interested in more specifics about harassment at Iowa State University and incorporating that information into the training programs to make it more pertinent and less generic. The next questions that need to be addressed are how big of a problem is harassment on campus? Is harassment prevention training helping?

## **Research Question 2 - What is the impact of harassment prevention training at ISU?**

### *Campus Climate*

Assessing the campus climate is always a difficult job. Many factors affect each individual's perception of what is good and what is bad, and many of the individuals on campus are not always aware of what is going on outside their immediate cluster of friends, family, co-workers, and department. In order to get an idea of how people felt about the campus climate, each participant was asked to what extent they thought harassment was a problem at Iowa State University. Every person interviewed thought to some extent harassment was a problem. The African American, male student stated that he thought harassment was just a small problem, the African American female student stated she thought it was an extensive and pervasive problem. The African American male student had only

been on campus a few months, and the African American female student had been on campus for several years in a variety of roles.

To add to this, three of the participants (23%) stated they had been the victims of harassment. Of these three people, one never said anything, one quit the job, and one took legal action. Additionally, seven of the 13 participants (54%) have directly observed or witnessed some type of harassment, whether it was directed at them, during a staff meeting, or in a hiring process. Of these seven, only three reported it or took action. All three were female. Four of the 13 participants (31%) have been made aware of some type of harassment that occurred on campus. Only two of the thirteen (15%) had not witnessed or been made aware of harassment. One of these was the African American male student who had only been on campus 10 months when he was interviewed. The other was the white, male faculty member who has been on campus for many years and who was not interviewed.

Another way to analyze the campus climate would be to examine statistics of reported instances of harassment and what the outcomes were after reporting. The next section will discuss campus statistics.

### *Harassment Statistics*

Although the Human Resource Office was willing to work with me at the beginning of this project, when it came to providing statistics the department office's help seemingly ended. I was first told that Human Resources did not keep statistics and then I was told they had already given them to me. One of the women who works as a sexual harassment assistor also tried to get them for me, but was had no more success with Human Resources than I did. I turned to the Department of Public Service (DPS) to see if they could help. DPS provided

me access to all public logs, as well as their statistics on the various reported incidents of harassment. According to DPS harassment falls under the category of intimidation which they define as unlawfully placing another person in a reasonable fear of bodily harm through the use of threatening words and/or other conduct without displaying a weapon or subjecting the victim to actual physical attack.

It is important to clarify that many of the reports made to DPS related to harassment are primarily between students, and the majority of them have to do with harassing phone calls. Additionally, some of the reports have to do with off campus situations, such as an ex-spouse, ex-boyfriend, or ex-girlfriend from off campus making unwanted calls or threats to an employee or student. In reviewing the public logs, it is often difficult to distinguish between faculty, staff and students.

---

Table 7

Number of report incidents of harassment from the Dept. of Public Safety's public logs

---

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Phone	66	56	63	60	38
Verbal*	16	12	22	24	30
E-mail	10	13	8	17	16
Physical	1	3	3	2	1
Written	6	4	3	7	2
Total	99	87	99	110	87

---

\*Verbal harassment includes all cases of harassment not otherwise specified.

Information from the Department of Public Safety was used to determine if incidences of harassment have increased, decreased, or stayed the same over the last five years.

Information was gathered from the public records and any reports coded as harassment were counted. This information included phone, verbal, e-mail, physical, and written forms of harassment. The highest rates of harassment were recorded in 2001, with 110 reported cases, and the lowest reported rates were in 1999 and 2002 with 87 reported cases. Although the majority of these cases involved students, the findings do suggest that harassment is still an issue that needs to be addressed.

A final way in which the campus was examined was to look at what is currently going on in terms of diversity issues. The following information was gathered by looking through the local newspapers, various departmental newsletters, and Iowa State University's website.

#### *What Happens on Campus?*

As Iowa State University has started to become more diverse in terms of gender, race, and ethnicity, the administration has been working hard to create a more inclusive environment for everyone. Since his arrival in July, 2001, President Geoffroy has stressed having an inclusive community. Early in 2002, the President's Committee on Diversity Matters was created. This committee is made up of faculty, staff, students, and Ames community members; it is designed to examine a variety of issues related to diversity including minority retention, the campus climate, and issues of sexuality. In January, 2003 the president also began a series of open meetings focusing on diversity.

The university also promotes diversity in a variety of other ways. Departments and student organizations routinely sponsor speakers and celebrations highlighting Women's



History Month, Women's Week, Martin Luther King Day, Black History Month, and various other cultural celebrations. The Iowa State University Lectures Program also brings in speakers associated with various gender and cultural celebrations.

Students must meet several diversity course requirements prior to graduation. Iowa State University wants to make sure its students are able to meet the challenges associated with a diverse global community. Students must complete three course credit hours in both U.S. Diversity and International Perspectives approved courses. The U.S. Diversity courses are those that focus on the multicultural society in the United States and the International Perspective courses focus on the global community.

Additionally, the Human Resources Office offers various forms of training on selected issues of diversity in which departments are interested. Departments or individuals can rent videos tackling a variety diversity issues. These videos can be used alone or a trainer can be scheduled to lead a discussion following the video. A website is also available featuring information on multicultural groups, upcoming events, a list of videos, and various other items related to Iowa State University's diversity initiative.

Finally, in 1999, the Affirmative Action office at Iowa State University changed its name to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. This change was made to reflect the more positive and inclusive role this office plays on campus and to eliminate the negative stereotypes that the term "Affirmative Action" evokes. This office handles issues related to nondiscrimination policies, sexual/racial/ethnic harassment policies, faculty conduct policies, and provides help for those who require forms, contact information, and assistance.

According to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity website:

The ultimate goal of the University's Equal Opportunity and Diversity Program is to reflect the diversity of the population in a high quality faculty and staff. The real success of translating the letter and spirit of the program into progress toward that goal rests with the members of the University community who render the initial recommendation with respect to which applicants are to be considered for employment as well as those who make the final determination. Thus, each individual's commitment to the University's goal is vital to its successful achievement.

Although the university is making strides at becoming more accepting of diversity and free of harassment, in the last few years several notable instances that easily could be considered harassment, specifically in terms of hostile environment. Several of these instances are reported in the discussion section of the following chapter.

#### *Follow-up and Assessment*

According to the Human Resource Office, when individuals participate in training it is recorded on their employment record. Periodically, a program is run to list the names of those individuals who have not participated on-line or in group training programs. Notification is sent to the individual's college, and then it is the college's responsibility to notify those in their department who still need to take the training. This is normally done by sending the names of those employees to the department chair and having the chair, or someone in the office, be responsible for notifying those employees who have not participated. It is then up to each person to participate in training. The chair of the department may or may not make sure each of her/his employees has participated. At this point, the individual participates in training or the cycle starts again.

In all fairness to the Human Resource Office, it is a difficult task for a small office to ensure that every employee has participated in training. Records on who has and who has not participated in harassment prevention training are confidential, so I was not able to find out how many people have not participated in harassment prevention training. Since the Human Resource Office leaves the responsibility of making sure each employee participates in training up to the department, it is unclear whether any punishment is imposed on the employee, department, or college when individuals are not participating. Understandably, mandatory training and follow-up was a major concern for those who were interviewed for this project.

Another way to evaluate how the participants in the study viewed Iowa State University's commitment to harassment prevention was to ask them what they thought was the overall purpose of Iowa State University implementing the harassment prevention training program. In order to evaluate this, what each participant said and the order in which it was said was evaluated. The first response that seven of the 13 participants (54%) gave had to do with improving the campus climate. Of these responses, four were faculty, two were P&S, and one was a student; four were women and three were men; and six were white and one was African American.

The first response that the remaining six participants (46%) gave, indicated that harassment prevention training was implemented for legal reasons. These responses included two white male faculty members, two African American students, and two white female P&S employees. However, three of them went on to say that training was also a preventative program: a white male faculty member, an African American male student, and a white

female P&S employee. The other three maintained that there were problems with the training program and that it was less geared toward helping faculty and staff and more geared toward preventing legal problems for Iowa State University.

### **Summary**

Although the sample size was small, obvious differences exist in who is participating in which type of training and their reasons for doing so. Women and minorities made up the majority of those participating in group training, and men made up the majority of those taking on-line training. Of the three African American participants, two participated in group training and one participated on-line. It is important to note that the African American male who participated on-line stated that he would have preferred group training. All but one of the white, male faculty members participated on-line; the other was obviously not at all pleased with group training. This same person participated in group training prior to the implementation of on-line training; had he been given the option, he said he would have done it on-line.

There are also clear differences in the benefits of each program. Both types of training provided for education and awareness; however, group training provided for interaction, learning from others, and good trainers. On-line learning provided the participants with more convenience, an ability to be self paced, and an opportunity to interact with the computer quiz. There were also drawbacks to both programs. Most notable for those in group training were the actions taken by other participants to create an unfriendly environment or just to be distracting. Related to this, for on-line training there was the concern that those who choose to participate by this means do not take it seriously. Other main concerns from both groups

were that training was not mandatory and that no real follow-up or additional training was provided. The participants also wanted to know what was really happening on campus in terms of reported cases and legal issues. They seemed to be concerned with the campus climate.

So, how has this training impacted campus climate? Without harassment-related statistics from the Human Resource Office, we really do not know. The participants have some valid concerns, most notably with the prevalence of harassment. Several of the participants have been harassed, several have witnessed it, and others have heard about it through their departments and colleagues or students. They are also concerned with the lack of mandatory requirements and follow-up to see who is participating in training.

Finally, the participants do seem to think that the purposed of implementing harassment prevention training is truly to create a more welcoming and accepting environment. But there are some skeptics. Several of those interviewed firmly believe that the policy and the training are merely for show and lack substance. The next chapter will provide a more thorough discussion of the results of these finding.

## 5.

### DISCUSSION

The university system and the individuals who make up this system have a dynamic (circular) relationship; the system shapes the individuals and the individuals shape the system. By providing the necessary skills that individuals need to be successful, the university creates a healthy and productive environment. If the individuals are in a healthy and productive environment, they are more likely to get more work done, take less time off, and provide for fewer turnovers; this maintains a more successful university system. There are multiple benefits when the system and the individuals can work together. Unfortunately, issues of power often come into play. Harassment is one of those issues that can easily upset the relationship between the university system and individuals who make up this system. In theory, harassment prevention training is designed to help individuals understand what behaviors are acceptable when working in a diverse environment and to help ensure the environment remains healthy and productive. However, when a university does not allow potential harassers and potential victims the opportunity to interact, what message are they truly sending?

In this chapter, the results of the study will be more thoroughly discussed as they relate to the research questions. Because of the small number of interviews conducted and the limitations to one college, it is possible a more university wide project would yield different results. As such, there is no reason to believe the results of the small number of interviews could be generalized to all colleges and departments on campus. However, with the

consistency of certain responses, it is possible that the benefits, drawbacks, and concerns may be generalized campus wide.

This chapter is divided into two themes paralleling the research questions. Each of these themes will be broken down further into assertions addressing specific concerns or findings within each of the research questions. The first theme addresses the differences between group and on-line training, and the second theme will look at the impact on the campus climate. The first theme will primarily be addressed under the scope of Muted Group Theory. The second theme will primarily be addressed from Habermas's view on the university. Additionally, the question of how these two come together will be examined. Data from interviews is used to support and clarify each assertion.

### **Research Question 1 – What are the differences between group and on-line training?**

Language is power. According to Muted Group Theory, our language system influences and limits our abilities to represent our experiences. Historically, women's and minority's experiences have been negated and they have also lacked power. (Ardner, 1975; Kramarae, 1981; Orbe, 1998; and Spender, 1984, 1998). In terms of Muted Group Theory, mutedness is caused by lack of power (Ardner, 1975). Harassment is also about power, and as the research has shown, women and minorities are the primary targets of harassment. By designing a training program for harassment prevention, this should give women and minorities the format to share their experiences; however, it is important to differentiate between the types of training.

### *Experiences and Perceptions*

One of the premises of Muted Group Theory is that women and men perceive the world differently based on their experiences rooted in the gendered division of labor. Looking at the division of labor at Iowa State University, we find 1203 male faculty and only 533 female faculty. Additionally, there are 644 male merit employees compared with 1268 female merit employees. The university breakdown demonstrates a strong emphasis on the gendered division of labor, with men in positions of power and women holding subordinate positions. This would definitely give both men and women different perspectives. These perspectives can be seen when looking at who participated in which type of training and why.

Six of the seven women (86%) who were interviewed participated by in group training. It is important to note that the woman who did participate on-line had previously participated in group training and chose to review the on-line training for her students and to re-review the definitions. Additionally, two of the three African Americans participated in group training. The one African American male who did not participate in group training was not offered this option and even stated that if he had been given the opportunity, he would have chosen to participate in group training.

Group training participants described the benefits of group training as learning from others (89%), education and awareness (78%), and interaction (67%). Those who participated in group training were very interested in hearing about other people's experience and being able to interact with others. In contrast, those who participated in on-line training cited the advantages of being able to work at your own desk/on your own time (100%), proceeding at one's own pace (75%), more appropriate to various learning styles (75%), and education and



awareness (75%) as benefits. Additionally, the white female and African American male who participated in on-line training both mentioned that one of the drawbacks to on-line training is not having interaction or at least someone there who could immediately clarify a point or answer a question.

Benefits such as working at your desk, going at your own pace, and having a variety of techniques to accommodate learning styles are important; however, harassment prevention is not classified as a hard skill or a technical ability. Unlike learning how to fix an engine, transfer phone calls, or repair a computer, harassment prevention is not a “one way to do it” skill. There are multiple forms of harassment and within those forms are many intricacies including language, action, and awareness. If one just wants to understand what Iowa State University harassment policy is, the policy is something that is concrete and can be learned on-line. “Understanding the policies can happen on-line, but I don’t think understanding people can happen through the computer,” stated a white, female P&S employee. However, learning what constitutes harassment, how prevalent harassment is, and how to prevent harassment is something quite different. The following two quotes sum this up very well. A white, female faculty stated:

Learning happens, I think, with people as well as with information. So the more that we can use each other, the more we can learn and the only way that we can do that is to respect one another and to listen to each other’s opinions and then reflect those back and forth.

A white, female P&S employee said:

The group that I participated with was mostly College of Education people. People in education, I believe, are probably more aware of harassment than the general population. So what I learned was the wide range, the wide spectrum of beliefs within what I thought would be a fairly narrow range.

Both of these women are very aware of the importance of learning from each other. The first quote speaks to the fact that there are several ways in which learning happens. But by learning from and respecting others we can gain very different insight. Additionally, individuals can use others' ideas and opinions to work back and forth to more fully understand what is going on.

The second quote is very significant in that it speaks to the fact that we have preconceived notions prior to going to into something. In this case, the assumption was made that because those in training were predominantly College of Education employees they would have very similar experiences, thus similar beliefs. This participant realized that was not the case at all.

Today, harassment is less overt than it was years ago. Since many forms of harassment are more covert or even unintentional, it is more important than ever to understand what these actions are and how they are used to support dominant views. If we fail to recognize others' experiences in the work force, it will only serve to perpetuate instances of harassment, by failing to realize what we are doing and how it affects others.

Additionally, we must look at why individuals participate in training. In reviewing the transcription notes from the 13 interviews, I noted 34 responses directed specifically at why faculty, staff, and students *should* participate in some type of harassment prevention training.

These responses included knowledge and skills building, issues of awareness, improving the campus climate, and law and policy awareness. Each of these is important, but it is more important to look at the reasons each employee gave for their participation in harassment prevention training.

Although the individuals I interviewed gave solid reasons for others to participate in training, the reasons they gave for participating in training were quite different. The 13 participants gave 27 responses explaining why they participated in harassment prevention training. These responses included a requirement, a choice, or in an evaluator or observer role. The overwhelming response, given by 85% of the participants, was that they had at one time or another been required to attend the harassment prevention training program(s). Only two of the participants actually stated that they had chosen to attend Iowa State University's harassment prevention training, although others had chosen to attend other types of diversity training offered on and off campus.

When asking individuals why someone should participate in training and why they participated in training we find substantial differences in the reasons. Even though many of the participants had multiple good reasons why people should participate, for the majority of the participants it primarily came down to some type of requirement. This by no means suggests that they did not benefit from the training, but it may suggest that because they felt they benefited from it, they thought that others would, too. The only individual who came across as somewhat upset about being required to participate in training was the male faculty member who chose to answer the questions by e-mail as opposed to by interview. He stated

that he disliked the training and the trainers and that it had been a waste of his time to participate.

It is significant to note that substantially different reasons were given as to why individuals should participate compared with why those interviewed in the study chose to participate. Only those responses indicating a choice to participate echoed any of the sentiment as to why individuals should participate in training. Those who were required to take the training did not appear to be angry about the requirement; however, many were dissatisfied with the timing or the means by which they were required to participate. An African American, male student and a white, male faculty member both stated that they were told to do it on-line. The faculty member had participated in group training previously, so he was not upset at the requirement to take it on-line; however, the student stated he would have preferred to participate in a group session.

The following comments suggest that required training is not always the best way to learn. According to a white, female P&S staff member, “The biggest difference is that the [trainings] that have been required have less interaction and less positive response, just because [individuals] are doing it because they have to.” A white, male faculty member was also concerned with individuals taking the on-line training seriously. He stated that “trying to make sure that people are spending time reading through and hopefully they are not just skimming,” should be a concern of the university.

Perceptions of how training is being taught, how many people are being reached, and how seriously people are taking the training may be contradictory to the reality of what is really happening.

*Silencing Women and Minorities While Perpetuating Power*

Muted Group Theory states that if men begin listening to women's experiences they risk losing power (Kramarae, 1981; Orbe, 1998 and Spender 1984, 1998). This could possibly be true for any dominant group that listens to a subordinate group. By not hearing what other groups have to say, we do not have to acknowledge that there is a problem. This is especially true if the dominant group is causing the problem for the subordinate group. This would make a strong case for many males and many employees in the higher ranks of the academy to participate in on-line training. For example, one of the white, male faculty members, when told he needed to take the training again, chose this time to do it on line because he "thought it would be a more enjoyable process than looking at someone telling me the same things again." Additionally, another white, male faculty member who chose not to be interviewed wrote that he did not find any benefit to having someone lecture at him.

It is possible that neither of these males had a positive experience of interaction within their group training or, depending on their training session, they may have felt they were the targets, in which harassment prevention training was being directed. It is also possible that neither of them have ever been victims of harassment. They may never have witnessed harassment; and may not realize the severity of the problem on campus. Therefore, they may unintentionally be sending the message that they do not think harassment is a problem, which reinforces the hegemonic order.

There are several ways that the dominant society uses its power to silence those they consider subordinate. One of the ways that men, or others in a dominant position, gain and maintain control of a conversation is by interrupting and focusing the attention back on

themselves (Kramarae, 1981; and West and Zimmerman, 1998). One of the biggest problems with group training that those interviewed mentioned had to do with the actions and comments made by other participants in the training session. Seven of the nine participants (78%) mentioned that there was a problem caused by disruptive participants or participants who did not want to be there. Some of the problems were as simple as individuals grumbling because they would rather be doing something else, but others clearly caused problems during the training.

One white male student who had participated in two different group trainings stated that the first training that he went to was very collegial; however, the second training was “hijacked” by a male who was there specifically to question policies and protocols in a specific harassment case. After interviewing this individual, I found that I had been in this same training session. Although the trainers did a good job handling the situation, those who were there to participate had to suffer through about 10-15 minutes of this white male challenging and questioning the trainers on the harassment case that had involved a faculty member in the College of Education. An African American, female student mentioned that during some of the sessions she observed:

Towards the end I noticed a lot of people would bring up examples just because they, well they were hostile in bringing up these examples. It wasn't to help everyone else learn their questions, they were really uneducational questions and questions they already knew the answers to.

The two individuals who did not cite having participant problems were both males in

faculty/administrator positions. The first male was the white faculty member who chose to not be interviewed. Because of the nature of his responses, I find it hard to believe that he took the training seriously. For example, when asked if he thought he had learned from participating in the training he simply replied, "Yes, because I am smart." Others who were interviewed answered this question with a much more specific answer relating to what they knew going into training and what they learned. Based on some of his other answers, it is important to consider that this individual's training may have been such that it was lecture only and intimidation by the trainers, causing those in attendance to remain quiet and cordial. According to this individual, he felt the trainers were "hostile" and he "did not like being lectured at."

The other individual who stated that there were no problems during his sessions is an African American male. Because of his position on campus, he is well known and commands respect. If there was somebody who would normally act out in his training group, they may have been on their best behavior. While the goal of this study was not to look at specific problems with the various training programs, this particular problem could be significant in terms of Muted Group Theory.

Another way to silence women and minorities would be to simply not participate in group training. Although this was not a particular question during the interview, four of the 13 participants (32.5%) stated that given a choice, they would always choose group training. This included all three African American participants and one white female P&S employee. If the majority of men decided to participate only in on-line training, a severe silencing would occur. While women and minorities would still participate in group training, to some extent

their dialogue would be like “preaching to the choir.” Harassment is much more common to women and minorities. If white males choose not to participate, those who do participate would be unable to confer their message to those who are in power and can facilitate change.

Another concern is the complete lack of responses from Merit employees. With two-thirds of the Merit employees being female, there is a concern for why none of these individuals chose to participate in the research. One factor may be that these positions are less flexible in the hours worked than the P&S and faculty positions. Because of this, Merit employees may have been required to take paid leave to participate in the interview process. Another factor may be related to the fact that Merit individuals are the most likely to be harassed. Merit employees may not have requested time to participate because they may believe that their employers would think they might be making accusations. Either of these reasons point to the lack of power by these employees.

Differences between individuals cause some people to want to participate in group and others in on-line training, but the influence of the university also contributes to individual beliefs about issues of harassment on campus. The next section will focus on the campus climate.

### **Research Question 2 – Impact on campus climate**

In order for harassment prevention training to be taken seriously, a strong emphasis on its importance needs to start from the top down. In this section, a more critical look will be taken at how and why the university implements harassment prevention training under the guise of Habermas.



### *Extrafuncational Abilities*

According to Habermas, it is the university's responsibility to equip its students with extrafunctional abilities (1970, p. 2). He describes these abilities as "those attributes and attitudes relevant to the pursuit of a professional career that are not contained per se in professional knowledge and skills" (1970, p. 2). Learning about diversity, including harassment prevention, is one area in which extrafunctional abilities could be learned. In order for these types of abilities to be learned, faculty and staff must be able to lead by example and incorporate what they learned into their classrooms or offices. According to a white, female P&S employee:

I think that people need to understand what makes a good working and learning environment. If you have harassment, that is obviously not maximum for learning and/or getting things done in the work place. Especially at a university where, I think, tolerance and understanding diversity should be a high priority. So if you don't promote that overall climate, then what are you teaching your students and what are they going to do when they go out into the real world?

In conjunction with this is the notion that harassment training should be extended beyond just for the staff at Iowa State University. Although anyone can participate on-line or attend many of the diversity programs on campus, several of the faculty thought that there needs to be a form of harassment prevention training that faculty can modify to use in their classrooms. Three of the individuals interviewed have positions that require physical contact with students and often student-to-student physical contact. All three of these individuals mentioned how significant this was in terms of harassment.

One faculty member told the story of how one of the students in the department went into another school to student teach and ended up getting accused of sexual harassment. Although the university and the school were able to work through this, it became a huge issue within the department. The act that was committed was almost an every day occurrence, but it was certainly not appropriate behavior for a student teacher. According to the faculty member, the students response was something like, “this is just how I am.”

It is very important for the university to make sure that the campus climate does not allow individuals to use this type of attitude for an excuse. The university needs to let individuals know what type of behavior is acceptable, what is not acceptable, and that there are repercussions for bad behavior. If the university does not convey that message, the lack of extrafunctional abilities may result in problems down the road for faculty, staff, and students.

### *Becoming Aware of Our Culture*

The second responsibility that Habermas states a university needs to do is “to transmit, interpret, and develop the cultural tradition of the society” (1970, p. 2). At first glance, it seems that by implementing an additional on-line training program the campus is aware that there is a problem with harassment and the university is trying to incorporate an additional means for faculty, staff, and students to learn about harassment prevention. Part of the university’s responsibility is to make sure individuals are aware of problems, and aware the university can help facilitate change to make the environment better.

One major question is: Do the university’s teachings regarding harassment tell us the whole story or just their version? This question became very apparent in my attempts to gather information for this research. I first tried to obtain numbers or statistics demonstrating

how prevalent harassment is on campus. I was told that the university has an intake form that is used to keep statistics on visits to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. I was able to get this form from the website, and one of the categories that individuals could check was related to discrimination, including race, gender, and sexual harassment. Directly on the front page, the form states it is used to keep statistical information. It includes space for all kinds of information that could have been used in this research, including gender, department, staff position and what the individual would like to have happen following their visit. According to Dziech and Hawkins (1998) universities want to keep a low profile on these issues; therefore, they tend to provide ineffective responses or they stonewall when questioned.

When I asked to view the statistics and outcomes from the intake form, I was first told that these types of statistics were not kept. When I asked again, I was told that I had been given this information already. Then, I made some calls to find out if anyone else could help. One of the sexual harassment assistants said that any time someone comes to see them they have to provide that information to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity. She also attempted to make some contacts with this office to see if maybe they would provide her with the information. Upon the completion of this thesis no one has responded to her.

How serious is the Equal Opportunity and Diversity Office about ensuring that all staff have participated in training? No punishment is imposed on the college, department, or individual who does not participate in training. Everyone is supposed to participate in training, so why is it that when I asked who had participated in on-line training so I could conduct my research I was told that this information is confidential?

A related problem concerns the perception of those interviewed of the prevalence of harassment on campus. To some extent, each individual thought that harassment was a problem on campus. One white, female faculty member stated, “I don’t think that it is an overt problem as in some places. I think that everyone here is very polite. I think it is a very invisible problem.” An African American, male faculty said:

Oh, I think [harassment] is a problem. To say it is pervasive and everywhere you look, that is not true. But I think it is a problem because those subtle incidents of harassment that I talk about, that I don’t think are very significant could be monumental for somebody depending on their age and experience. How big or how small just depends, but it is a problem and it is present.

Finally, one African American, female student stated that, “it is a problem here, racial harassment also, and it really should be addressed more. But I think people are very tentative when it comes to reporting it, and I think that is why, well, just one of the reasons why it happens so often.”

Harassment does seem to be a problem; it seems to be one of those unspoken problems that just keeps festering because it has not been dealt with. During the interviews, individuals expressed a need for more information about harassment issues on campus. Individuals specifically mentioned that they wanted to know what the statistics were. They also expressed that training would be more effective if real examples from campus were used. The following are some examples from the campus newspaper, *The Iowa State Daily*, that address several of the issues that could have been effectively used.

It was reported in April 2001 an American Indian faculty member was going to be denied tenure and subsequently fired. The chair of the department cited that this individual did not have significant scholarly work, his hypotheses lacked, and that his scholarship was immature. Although this decision was later overturned, the faculty member believes that the original decision was not based on what the chair had cited, but was due to racial issues. Any time race is involved in an issue, questions of the real motivation of the individuals' actions are likely to arise.

On August 28, 2001, a sophomore in journalism and mass communication reported that she had been abducted and raped by four black males. The following day she admitted that the report she filed was not true. Although this student is no longer at Iowa State University, the fear she caused the females on campus and the stigma she placed on the African American community will not be forgotten. And the campus community never did find out why she made this false accusation.

In spring of 2002, another incident occurred between a white male graduate student and a multiracial tenure-track female professor in a gender and ethnicity class. The graduate student, who was auditing the course, was removed by the university administration because of inappropriate comments the student was making during class and during private discussions with the faculty member. Because of the Buckley Amendment<sup>3</sup> the professor was not allowed to comment on the specifics of the incident. However, the various local newspapers were not afraid to draw conclusions based solely on the student's side of the story, routinely attacking the professor's credibility as both a female and person of color.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Buckley Amendment states that faculty and staff are responsible to protect the privacy of the student and the student's educational records: including personal information, records, grades, and exams.

Although only those directly involved during the case will ever know what happened, it leads to the question of what would have happened if the faculty member had been male, white, or tenured. It also raises questions as to why someone would select to participate in a class, if she/he was not there to learn about the material.

May 2002 brought with it another issue with racial overtones. Two administrators in the Greenlee School of Journalism and Communication were asked to step down from their positions when issues of discrimination against white professors, racism, and hostility were reported as causes for the turmoil within the school. On further investigation, it was found by the Faculty Senate Task Force that issues of racism had nothing to do with the problems within the school. Even though this issue was addressed, the various media that covered the story still included something about racial or diversity issues. These false accusations not only hurt the reputation of the men who were asked to step down, but also the reputation of the school and its faculty. The continual dwelling of the race issue by the local media also demonstrates how the media uses race to sensationalize stories. This also implies the lack of understanding of issues related to race by our everyday society.

Finally, in the fall of 2002, for a women's studies class project, several female students contacted the dorm director about a mural they thought was inappropriate. The mural portrayed three men dressed in military uniforms. One of the men was carrying a keg and one of them had a scantily clad female under his arm. Also, the mural had been a victim of graffiti —the woman being named and the word "tool" written on her forehead, references to "roofies" had been added, and a headband on the man holding the girl said "date raper extraordinaire." The men were also carrying condoms and lubrication on their belts in place

of ammunition. Once reported, the graffiti was immediately removed and eventually the female was painted out of the picture. Of all the things going on around campus, this raised a particularly disturbing sentiment among male and female students that the women who reported this were nothing but whiners or man haters. Many supported the removal of the mural, but an abundance of students and alumni described this as nothing more than “boys will be boys.” Even though this type of sentiment was directed at a picture, it is this very attitude that leads to other actions resulting in the degradation of women. Additionally, the young women raising the complaint at the university did not receive the strong support of the university in dealing with this issue. Instead, the university administration left the decisions of what to do up to the students. It is ironic how all references to alcohol have been eliminated in the dorms, yet negative references made about women are not taken seriously.

It is easy to see that issues relating to gender and race/ethnicity are prevalent on campus. When we simply view actions, instead of critically examining them within the context of race and gender, it is no wonder that issues and actions related to sexual/racial/ethnic harassment are so difficult to prevent.

All of these things seem to work together to prevent us from understanding what our campus climate truly is like. By not addressing these types of issues, the university is preventing its faculty staff and students from truly realizing what our culture is really about.

#### *Political Consciousness or Status Quo?*

Habermas states that the university “forms the political consciousness of its students” (1970, p. 3). Students learn from the university, from its faculty and its staff, and through its policies and procedures. When universities fail to make various concepts or ideas

a priority for a campus, it sends a message to the students and staff that these particular concepts or ideas are not important. According to one white, female P&S employee:

How people are treated in the classroom is partly your responsibility as the instructor.

Some people don't think; they think that they are just there to give information. But that is part of teaching; you know if people are hostile or upset or hurt or whatever, they are not going to learn in that situation.

Part of having a political consciousness is being able to speak up and be heard. This leads to the question, "what message is the university sending by implementing an on-line training program?" No longer can we speak up and be heard, instead we can keep quiet and interface. No longer do individuals have to be made uncomfortable or inconvenienced by actually having to listen to women and minority members describe their experiences. Clearly, female and minority issues will no longer be "crammed down our throats."

One of the most interesting findings of this research is what individuals think is the overall purpose of Iowa State University's implementation of the training program. Their responses ranged anywhere from improving campus climate (54%) to more legal reasons (46%). According to an African American, female student:

I think the *only* reason that ISU implements this program, it seems very obvious to me, is just to protect themselves. They are mandated, I believe, yes they are mandated to provide sexual harassment training. So I think the only reason that they do that is so that if someone does come forth with a complaint, they can say we followed all the steps and all the requirements necessary to adhere to the mandated policy, so we



cannot be found at fault. I think that is the *only* reason ISU does it. I think they would prefer to spend that money elsewhere.

Not everyone was quite so resolute in their doubt; but many of those who did believe that the training was geared to improving the campus, still expressed some doubt. One white male faculty member stated:

Hopefully, the purpose [of harassment prevention training] is to reduce the incidences of harassment. I don't think that will occur unless people become aware of the issues.

You would hope that our faculty and staff have learned good behavior, but apparently that is still not the case.

Although he says that he believes the training is to promote a better campus climate, there is still doubt in his mind about individuals becoming aware of the issues. Not all the participants expressed this kind of doubt, but many of them were concerned with university follow-up.

Participants who did believe the university was trying to improve the campus climate still questioned its commitment to follow-up. Almost all the participants stated that there needs to be some type of follow-up. On one hand, individuals were saying that the training is designed to improve campus climate, but on the other hand, they cited no follow-up as a major problem. This lack of follow-up does tend to make one question the university politics. According to one white, female, P&S employee:

I also think it should be more than once in their lifetime. I think there is no way you can expect people to really learn and try to make it, make them be more understanding of what the issues are, so they are more accepting and able to work with a bigger

variety of people, successfully and sensitively, and all that kind of stuff, from a one time two-hour workshop or half a morning workshop.

One final thing that two of the on-line individuals brought up is just the overall seriousness of those who take training on-line. It is very easy for individuals to quickly skip through the training without even reading. There is no real way to monitor individuals and make sure they are taking the training seriously, so how can this send a positive message about the importance of harassment issues?

### **Summary**

Harassment prevention is the responsibility of the individual as well as the institution. Going back to Habermas, work, interaction, and power all play a major role in harassment prevention training. At the university, many employees first encounter harassment and harassment prevention training. Because of the uniqueness of the university setting, many people have the opportunity to work with students. During our interactions with students, whether as a faculty, staff, or teaching assistant, we have the opportunity to leave an indelible mark on them. Hopefully the mark that we leave is one that will help them in their future careers as well as in making the future a better place.

Part of the mark that we leave will be caused by our interactions with them as well as our interactions with each other. Interaction is the way we learn from and about each other. Demonstrating that we can responsibly interact with each other is one of the best impressions we can leave. By taking this interaction away, especially when dealing with difficult topics like harassment, what message do we send?

Finally, there is a constant struggle between the individual's power and the university's power. By taking a way a mode of communication demonstrated to be essential to women and minorities, those individuals become muted and powerless. This same act reinforces the power of the dominant group. The power at the university happens to come from white males in the upper echelons of administration. Without individuals to listen and hear the problems, they will never be addressed. This attitude of unimportance permeates the university. As the university graduates society's future, by failing to tackle issues of harassment prevention they continue to perpetuate the dominant culture.

## 6.

**CONCLUSION****Implications**

This study examined the differences between group and on-line harassment prevention training implemented by Iowa State University. Although an abundance of research relates to issues of harassment and issues related to training programs and methods, no research was found comparing group training to on-line training in relation to communicative skills or attitude and/or perception change. Because on-line training is touted as money and time saving, and as a better way to learn, it is important to take a look at what type of training is being evaluated when these claims are being made. In all of the research, the types of training that had been done were related more toward “hard skills,” including using a computer, operating various forms of equipment, or various other technical or practical skills. No information was found related to issues of diversity, communication skills, or interpersonal interaction.

The particular type of on-line training identified by Driscoll (1997) as multimedia web-based uses only the computer to communicate content; it does not provide for asynchronous communication. She states that this type of communication is most commonly used in organizations looking to save money, rather than to provide educational capabilities. Although all of the individuals who participated in group training stated that they would prefer group training, many of them stated that this type of on-line training is a good reference for legal issues and policies.

This particular research on examines how universities are tackling the issue of harassment prevention training. However, unlike much of the research on training programs, this research compares two types of training programs on a different type of skill. Additionally, instead of looking at the benefits from the administrative level, it looks at the perceptions and opinions of the recipients.

The lack of responses, especially from the Human Resource Office, is a concern. When neither the employees of the university nor those in charge of harassment prevention training and policy participate in research it shows a genuine lack of concern for this issue. This reaction continues to perpetuate a white, male hegemonic order.

### **Limitations of the Study**

For this study, only those faculty, staff, and students within the College of Education were interviewed. Those interviewed in this study represent a cross section of the university's population, with participants ranging from students to administrators. However, because of the small number of interviews conducted and the limitation to one college, it is possible that a more university-wide project would yield different results. Additionally, Iowa State University is a predominantly white campus, which definitely affects the perception of harassment and the means to a campus wide-education of harassment prevention.

Another concern is in the self-selection of the participants. Even though letters and e-mails were sent to all faculty, staff, and graduate students in the College of Education, each individual decided whether she/he wanted to participate. This may lead to only those participating who were genuinely concerned with issues of harassment or had a specific agenda to communicate.

There is no reason to believe the results of the small number of interviews could be generalized to all college and university campuses or departments across the country. Hopefully, because of the significance of diversity education and the current trend in computer mediated and on-line learning, additional studies will be done in various colleges and universities throughout the United States to determine how these methods of harassment prevention training serve the university community.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

This research was the first step in comparing group and on-line training for what are often considered communicative or interaction skills. There are many directions that this type of research could go. More quantitative research might give a more overall perspective of how well these two types of training are working to create a more hospitable workforce. Additionally, research on a more diverse campus could produce significant differences.

Also, additional research needs to be done to examine harassment statistics at the university level and to see what kinds of issues are most prevalent. Did the perpetrators participate in any kind of training? Research looking at how various institutions are conducting their on-line training might also result in significant differences. For example, synchronous versus asynchronous training may be an effective method of training and education. One other way to gauge who is participating in which type of training would be to develop a quick survey that could be completed by a mass e-mail to the campus. A short survey looking at employee demographics, if they participated in training, and by what means would help get a better understanding of how much follow up is being done to ensure employees are taking it and what type of training are the majority of employees participating.

## **Conclusion**

This research showed that there are significant differences between group and on-line training. Research question 1 focused on the differences between group and on-line training. The first difference was in who was participating in which type of training. Overwhelmingly, women and minorities preferred group training to on-line training, citing learning from others and interaction as two of the most important benefits of the training program. Group training gives women and minorities a voice about issues directly relating to their environmental wellbeing. Even though there were some drawbacks to group training, especially problems associated with other participants, those women and minorities who participated in training stated that they believed this was the best way for individuals to learn about diversity issues such as harassment.

However, on-line training also offered several benefits. Those who participated in this type of training liked the fact that it was self-paced and that they could participate in it on their own time. Additionally, several of the participants thought this type of training was a good way to incorporate different learning styles. There were two major drawbacks: lack of interaction and lack of seriousness given to the training by participants. Both the woman and the minority who participated in on-line training stated that not having any interaction did prove to be a drawback; neither of the white, male faculty members stated this to be a problem. Another significant concern of those interviewed was how seriously an individual would be when participating in on-line training.

Several overall concerns were expressed by participants relating to either type of training. A majority of the participants felt that the training needed to be mandatory and that

there also needed to be some type of follow-up, refresher course, or information developed. An additional concern was that the training was not addressing issues of harassment head on. Several of the participants stated that they wanted more information relating to Iowa State University's campus climate. They thought that if individuals had a better understanding of the statistics and various issues related to campus there might be a more positive response to training.

Overall, the majority of those who participated in this research seemed concerned with improving the campus climate and improving the type of training that was available to the staff and students of the university. However, there were concerns with how serious the university was regarding issues of harassment. Just under half of the participants indicated that they thought the purpose of harassment training was more to serve the legal needs of the university than to improve the climate for staff and students. Additionally, many of the participants questioned how mandatory harassment prevention training truly was. This question also came up in my mind as I received numerous responses from individuals stating that they had never participated in training or had not even known it was required.

The second research question looked at the impact of harassment prevention training on the Iowa State University campus. In trying to find the actual statistics, I found myself being stonewalled by the Human Resources Office. I was only able to obtain reported cases of harassment from the Department of Public Safety; Human Resources provided none. These numbers demonstrated relatively small differences from 1998 to 2002 in calls regarding harassment. It is important to keep in mind that many of the reports made were



from students regarding other students, and they do not necessarily reflect the campus environment as a whole.

Almost all of the individuals who participated in the survey thought that, to some extent, harassment is a problem on campus. Additionally, a good majority of individuals had witnessed or had second hand knowledge of an issue of harassment on campus. Several participants had themselves been victims of harassment.

One final way of assessing the impact of harassment prevention training on campus was to look to the campus newspaper. Even though this does not always give the most accurate accounts of what is going on, there seems to be an abundance of issues and stories related to some form of harassment. Stories ranged from a false report of rape by several black males made by a white student, issues of promotion and tenure denials related to race and gender, issues of freedom of speech/art, and even of faculty being harassed by students.

Yet, we will never truly know if the campus climate is improving unless the university itself becomes more proactive in addressing these issues. The last survey of campus climate was completed in 1996 by responses made in 1993 and 1994, which makes one wonder how much the university truly cares. When issues of convenience in training take precedence over other forms of education at an institution of higher learning, one wonders what message the administration is sending. The university's main purpose is to educate; however, one wonders what type of education are we getting regarding issues of harassment when the only power that victims of harassment have is voice, and that is slowly being taken away.

## APPENDIX A

### INVITATION LETTER

[Date]

Dear [Name]:

You are invited to be in a research study of the Sexual/Racial/Ethnic Harassment Prevention Training program at Iowa State University. This study is being done by Julie Snyder-Yuly, a graduate student at Iowa State University. If you are interested in participating in this study, I ask that you read this document and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to participate.

As Iowa State University, a predominately White campus, continues to become more diverse, it is important to examine how the university is handling the possible problems that may arise concerning differences in gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and race. This study will review the history of prevention training at ISU, the ways in which this particular program is delivered to employees, and how the participants assess the program. The research seeks to answer the following questions: Are there any differences between web-based and in-group training? What is the demographic nature of the participants in each type of training session? Has there been an attitudinal or perceptual shift after participating in the training? The participant's role in this study will be to evaluate the training program in which they participated.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete a short questionnaire and a personal interview. The questionnaire will be used to obtain demographic information, including: age, ethnicity, gender, and position at Iowa State University. The interview will be used to gather individual's personal assessment of Iowa State University's sexual/racial/ethnic harassment prevention training program. The interview will take approximately an hour, and the participant and researcher will mutually agree upon the time and location.

There will be no physical risk in participating in this research project. This study is not designed to evoke emotions; however, there may be some emotional risks due to the nature of the topic. First, participants may experience emotional discomfort when discussing the topics of sex, race, and ethnicity. Second, this study may also evoke strong emotions in cases where the participant is currently experiencing or has experienced harassment related to gender, race, or ethnicity. If the participant feels a strong negative reaction, the interview will be postponed, rescheduled or terminated upon her/his request.

The records of this study will be kept private. Any report that might be published will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. A system of coding will be used to ensure confidentiality. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Iowa State University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with Iowa State University.

If, during the course of this research study, significant new findings are discovered that might influence your willingness to continue, the researchers will inform you of those developments. If you may have any questions you can contact me at 515-294-9867 or by e-mail at [jlsnyder@iastate.edu](mailto:jlsnyder@iastate.edu) or contact my advisor Dr. Tracey Owens Patton at 515-294-0485 or [topatton@iastate.edu](mailto:topatton@iastate.edu).

Sincerely,

Julie Snyder-Yuly

## APPENDIX B

### CONSENT FORM

#### Sexual/Racial/Ethnic Harassment Training

As Iowa State University, a predominately White campus, continues to become more diverse, it is important to examine how the university is handling the possible problems that may arise concerning differences in gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and race. This study will review the history of prevention training at ISU, the ways in which this particular program is delivered to employees, and how the participants assess the program. The research seeks to answer the following questions: Are there any differences between web-based and in-group training? What is the demographic nature of the participants in each type of training session? Has there been an attitudinal or perceptual shift after participating in the training? The participant's role in this study will be to evaluate the training program in which they participated.

As part of this study, you will be asked to complete a short questionnaire and a personal interview. The questionnaire will be used to obtain demographic information, including: age, ethnicity, gender, and position at Iowa State University. The interview will be used to gather individual's personal assessment of Iowa State University's sexual/racial/ethnic harassment training program. The interview will take approximately an hour, and the participant and researcher will mutually agree upon the time and location.

There will be no physical risk in participating in this research project. This study is not designed to evoke emotions; however, there may be some emotional risks due to the nature of the topic. If a strong negative reaction is felt by the participant, the interview will be postponed, rescheduled or terminated upon his/her request.

The records of this study will be kept private. Any report that might be published will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. A system of coding will be used to ensure confidentiality. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Iowa State University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with Iowa State University. If, during the course of this research study, significant new findings are discovered that might influence your willingness to continue, the researchers will inform you of those developments.

You may ask any questions you have now, or contact me later at 515-294-9867 or by e-mail at [jlsnyder@iastate.edu](mailto:jlsnyder@iastate.edu) or contact my advisor Dr. Tracey Owens Patton at 515-294-0485 or [topatton@iastate.edu](mailto:topatton@iastate.edu).

You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

#### Statement of Consent:

I have read the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Investigator or Person Obtaining Consent \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C

### INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview questions for Faculty, Professional and Scientific, and Merit Employees  
who have participated **on-line** in Iowa State University's Sexual/Racial/Ethnic  
harassment prevention training program.

1. How did you become aware of the sexual/racial/ethnic harassment prevention training program?
2. Why did you participate in this training program?
3. Do you feel that the sexual/racial/ethnic harassment prevention-training program should be required for all staff at Iowa State University? Why?
4. Do you feel that taking this training on-line is more or less effective than group training? Why?
5. Do you feel there is an accessible means of raising questions and concerns during and after the online program training?
6. About how long did it take you to complete the on-line training programs?
7. What do you feel that you learned from participating in this training program?
8. What do you think is the overall purpose of Iowa State University implementing this training program?
9. Do you think that this training program is successful in promoting understanding of harassment issues?
10. What, if any, changes would you make to this training program? For example different or additional materials, follow-up, or presentation style.
11. In what ways do you see the implementation of this program fitting into and contributing to the overall campus climate?
12. How big of an issue do you think harassment is at Iowa State University?
13. Have you ever been harassed? If so, did you report it? Why/Why not?
14. Is there anything you would like to add?
15. Are there any questions I should have asked?

Interview questions for Faculty, Professional and Scientific, and Merit Employees who have participated **in groups** in Iowa State University's Sexual/Racial/Ethnic harassment training program.

1. How did you become aware of the sexual/racial/ethnic harassment training program?
2. Why did you participate in this training program?
3. Do you feel that the sexual/racial/ethnic harassment training program should be required for all staff at Iowa State University?
4. Do you feel that participating in a group session is more or less effective than online training? Why?
5. During the group session were discussion and questions encouraged?
6. What was the overall climate during your training session?
7. Was the person who conducted the training session well informed on the issues of sexual/racial/ethnic harassment?
8. Was the person who conducted the training session sensitive to the needs of the audience?
9. What do you feel that you learned from participating in this training program?
10. What do you think is the overall purpose of Iowa State University implementing this training program?
11. Do you think that this training program is successful in promoting understanding of harassment issues?
12. What, if any, changes would you make to this training program? For example different or additional materials, follow-up, or presentation style.
13. In what ways do you see the implementation of this program fitting into and contributing to the overall campus climate?
14. How big of an issue do you think harassment is at Iowa State University?
15. Have you ever been harassed? If so, did you report it? Why/Why not?
16. Is there anything you would like to add?
17. Are there any questions I should have asked?

## REFERENCES CITED

- Adams, J. (1997). Sexual harassment and Black women: A historical perspective. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research, and treatment*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Aguirre, Jr. A. & Baker, D. (Eds.) (2000). *Structured inequality in the United States: Critical discussions on the continuing significance of race, ethnicity, and gender*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Anderson, T. (1988). Black encounter of racism and elitism in white academe: A critique of the system. *Journal of Black Studies*, 8(3), 259-272.
- Antonio, A. (2003). Diversity and the influence of friendship groups in college. *The Review Of Higher Education*, 25(1), 63-89.
- Ardner, S. (Ed.) (1975). *Perceiving women*. London: Malaby.
- Asante, M. (1998). Identifying racist language: Linguistic acts and signs. In Hect, M. (Ed.), *Communicating prejudice*. (pp. 87-98). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Baldwin, J., Day, E. & Hecht, M. (2000). The structure(s) of racial attitudes among white college students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24 (5), 553-577.
- Biaggio, M. & Brownell, A. (1996). Addressing sexual harassment: Strategies for prevention. In M. Paludi (Ed.) *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power*. (pp. 215-234). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Black authors hold pessimistic outlook for African American prospects in higher education. (1996, Spring). *Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 11, 74-77.
- Blanchard, P. & Thacker, J.W. (1998). *Effective training: systems, strategies, and practices*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bonacich, E. (2000). Racism in the deep structure of U.S. higher education: When affirmative Action is not enough. In Aguirre, Jr. A. & Baker, D. (Eds.) (2000). *Structured inequality in the United States: Critical discussions on the continuing significance of race, ethnicity, and gender*. (pp. 67-76). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bowser, B., Auletta, G. & Jones, T. (1993). *Confronting diversity issues on campus*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Chang, M. (2000). Improving campus racial dynamic: A balancing act among competing interests. *The Review of Higher Education*, 23(2), 153-175.
- Chen, C. & Kleiner, B. (1999). Racial harassment in the workplace. *Equal Opportunities International*, 8(5), 48-53.
- Clark, R. and Lyons, C. (1999, July). Using Web-based training wisely. *Training*, 51-56.
- Collins, P. (1998). *Fighting words: Black women and the search for justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Corr, P. & Jackson, C (2001). Dimensions of perceived sexual harassment: effects of gender, and status/liking of protagonist. *Personality and Individual Differences* 30, 525-539.
- D'Souza, D. (1991). *Illiberal education*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- de la Luz Reyes, M. & Halcon, J. (2000). Racism in academia: The old wolf revisited. In Aguirre, Jr. A. & Baker, D. (Eds.) (2000). *Structured inequality in the United States: Critical discussions on the continuing significance of race, ethnicity, and gender*. (pp. 83-91). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Deadrick, D., McAfee, R., & Champagne, P. (1996). Preventing workplace harassment: An organizational change perspective. *Journal of Organizational Change* 9(2), 66-75.
- DeFour, D. (1996). The interface of racism and sexism on college campuses. In M. Paludi (Ed.) *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power*. (pp. 49-55). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Driscoll, M. (1997). Defining internet-based and web-based training. *Performance Improvement*, 36(4), 5-9.
- Dziech, B. & Hawkins, M. (1998). *Sexual harassment in higher education*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing.
- Dziech, B. & Weiner, L. (1990). *The lecherous professor*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Earnest, K. (1997). Reported instance of discrimination by faculty and students' perceptions of campus climate at a Midwestern university. Unpublished master's thesis, Iowa State University, Ames, IA.

- Elgart, L. & Schanfield, L. (1996). Sexual harassment of university students. In B. Lott & J. Reilly (Eds.) *Combating sexual harassment in higher education*. (pp. 158-177). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Ewing, J. (2000). Enhancement of online and offline student learning. *Educational Media International*, 37(4), 205-217.
- Feagin, J. (1992). The continuing significance of racism: Discrimination against black students in white colleges. *Journal of Black Studies*, 22(4), 546-578.
- Fister, S. (1998, December). Web-based training on a shoestring. *Training*, 43-47.
- Fitzgerald, L. (1996a). Definitions of sexual harassment. In B. Lott & J. Reilly (Eds.) *Combating sexual harassment in higher education*. (pp. 42-54). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Fitzgerald, L. (1996b). The Prevalence of sexual harassment. In B. Lott & J. Reilly (Eds.) *Combating sexual harassment in higher education*. (pp. 55-68). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Fitzgerald, L. (1996c). Institutional policies and procedures. In B. Lott & J. Reilly (Eds.) *Combating sexual harassment in higher education*. (pp. 129-140). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Fitzgerald, L. & Weitzman, L. (1990). Men who harass: Speculation and data. In M. Paludi (Ed.) *Ivory power: Sexual harassment on campus*. (pp. 125-140). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Golden, D., Niles, T. & Hecht, M. (1998). Jewish American identity. In J. Martin, T. Nakayama & L. Flores (Eds.) *Readings in cultural contexts*. (pp. 62-70). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Gonzales, M. (1998). Abandoning the sacred hierarchy: Disempowering hegemony through surrender to spirit. In Hecht, M. (Ed.), *Communicating prejudice*. (pp. 223-234). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Habermas, J. (1970). *Toward a rational society*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Hall, L. (1993). Compromising positions. In B. Thompson and S. Tyagi (Eds.) *Beyond a dream deferred: Multicultural education and the politics of excellence*. (pp. 162-173). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hecht, M., Collier, J. and Ribeau, S. (1993). *African American communication: Ethnic identity and cultural interpretation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.



- Helly, D. (1996). Institutional strategies: Creating a sexual harassment panel. In M. Paludi (Ed.) *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power*. (pp. 259-278). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Halualani, R. (1998). Seeing through the screen: A struggle of "culture." In J. Martin, T. Nakayama, & L. Flores (Eds.) *Readings in cultural context*. (pp. 264-275). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Hurtado, S. (1992). The campus racial climate: Contests of conflict. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(5), 539-569.
- Iowa State University Affirmative Action Office (2001). Policy on Sexual Harassment.
- Iowa State University Human Resource Department. Classification and Compensation Retrieved February 6, 2003 from <http://www.hrs.iastate.edu/ClassComp/>
- Iowa State University Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity Retrieved February 9, 2003 from <http://www.public.iastate.edu/~aao/eod/introduction.shtml>
- Jarmon (2001). Unwritten rules of the game. In R. Mabokela and A. Green (Eds.), *Sisters of the academy: Emergent black women scholars in higher education*. (pp. 175-181). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Kalof, L., Eby, K., Matheson, J., & Kroska, R. (2001). The influence of race and gender on student self-reports of sexual harassment by college professors. *Gender and Society*, 15(2), 282-302.
- Kent, N. J. (1996). The new campus racism: What's going on? *The NEA Higher Education Journal*, 83-94.
- Kesselman, A., McNair, L., & Schniedewind, N. (2003). *Women images and realities: A multicultural anthology*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.
- Kirk, G. and Okazawa-Rey, M. (2000) *Women's Lives: Multicultural perspectives*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Kramarae, C. (n.d.). Technology policy, gender, and cyberspace. Retrieved March 22, 2002 from <http://www.law.duke.edu/journals/djglp/articles/gen4p149.htm>.
- Kramarae, C. (1981). *Women and Men Speaking*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

- Kramarae, C. & Taylor, H (1993). Women and men on electronic networks: A conversation or a Monologue. In H. Taylor, C. Kramarae, & M. Ebben (Eds.), *Women, information technology, & scholarship*. (pp. 52-61). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.
- Larson, C. & Ovando, C. (2001). *Color of bureaucracy*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Lindsley, S. (1998). Communicating prejudice in organizations. In *Communicating racism* (pp. 187-205). M. Hecht (Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lott, B. (1996). Sexual harassment: Consequences and remedies. In B. Lott & J. Reilly (Eds.) *Combating sexual harassment in higher education*. (pp. 229-244). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Luthar, H. & Pastille, C. (2000). Modeling subordinate perceptions of sexual harassment: The role of superior-subordinate social-sexual interaction. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(2), 211-244.
- Marcus, L. (1996). *Fighting words: The politics of hateful speech*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- McClelland, K. & Auster, C (1990). Public platitudes and hidden tensions: Racial climates at predominantly white liberal arts colleges. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61(6), 607-642.
- Mecca, S. & Rubin, L. (1999). Definitional research on African American students and sexual harassment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23(4), 813.
- Mobley, M. & Payne, T. (1992). Backlash! The challenge to diversity training. *Training & Development*, 46(12), 45-52
- Morris, L. & Parker, S. (1996). *Multiculturalism in academe: A source book*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing.
- Nance, T. & Foeman, A. (1998). On being biracial in the United States. In J. Maritn, T. Nakayama & L. Flores (Eds.) *Readings in cultural contexts*. (pp. 53-61). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- The National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education (2001) Retrieved March 22, 2002 from <http://homepages.ius.edu/Special/GenderEq/ncsee.html>.
- Office of Institutional Research, Iowa State University. (2002). *Fact Book 2002-2003*. Iowa State University: Ames, IA.

- Olivas, M. (1992). The Political economy of immigration, intellectual property, and racial harassment: case studies of the implementation of legal change on campus. *Journal of Higher Education*, 63(5), 570-598.
- Orbe, M. (1998). *Construction co-cultural theory: An explication of culture, power, and communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Overmyer Day, L. (1995). The pitfalls of diversity training. *Training & Development*, 49(5), 25-29.
- Pace, R., Smith, P., & Mills, G. (1991). *Human resource development: the field*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Paludi, M. (1996). Ethnicity, sex, and sexual harassment. In B. Lott & J. Reilly (Eds.) *Combating sexual harassment in higher education*. (pp. 212-228). Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Quina, K. (1996). Sexual harassment and rape: A continuum of exploitation. In M. Paludi (Ed.) *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power*. (pp. 183-197). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Rabinowitz, V. (1996). Coping with sexual harassment. In M. Paludi (Ed.) *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power*. (pp. 199-212). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Roberts, B. (1998, August). Via the desktop://. *HRMagazine*, 99-104.
- Rupert, A. & Holmes, D. (1997). Dual relationships in higher education: Professional and institutional guidelines. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68(6), 660-678.
- Ruth, S. (1998). *Issues in feminism: An introduction to women's studies 4<sup>th</sup> edition*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Salisbury, J. & Jaffe, F. (1996). Individual training of sexual harassers. In M. Paludi (Ed.) *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory power*. (pp. 141-152). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sandler, B. (1996a). Student-to-student sexual harassment. In B. Sandler & R. Shoop (Eds.) *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students*. (pp. 50-66). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Sandler, B. (1996b). Elements of a good policy. In B. Sandler & R. Shoop (Eds.) *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students*. (pp. 104-127). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sandler, B. & Shoop, R. (1996). What is sexual harassment. In B. Sandler & R. Shoop (Eds.) *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students*. (pp. 1-21). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schrivver, R. & Giles, S. (1999, August). Real ROI numbers. *Training & Development*, 51-52.
- Seals, B. (1996). Faculty-to-faculty sexual harassment. In B. Sandler & R. Shoop (Eds.) *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students*. (pp. 66-84). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sedlacek, W. & Brooks, Jr., G. (1976). *Racism in American education: A model for change*. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Shepela, S. & Levesque, L. (1998). Poisoned waters: Sexual harassment and the college climate. *Sex Roles*, 38(7/8), 589-611.
- Sidel, R. (1994). *Battling bias, The struggle for identity and community on college campuses*. New York, NY: Viking Press.
- Society for Human Resource Management. Workplace diversity initiative. *Society for Human Resource Management*. Retrieved October 13, 2000 from <http://www.shrm.org/diversity/training1.htm>
- Spender, D. (1984). Defining reality: A powerful tool. In C. Kramarae, M. Schulz, and W. O'Barr (Eds.) *Language and power*. (pp. 194-205). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Spender, D. (1998). *Man made language*. London: Pandora Press.
- Steering Committee on Diversity. (1995). A study of the campus climate at Iowa State University.
- Tang, C., Yik, M., Cheung, F., Choi, P., Au, K., & Phil, M. (1996). Sexual harassment of Chinese college students. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 25, 201-215.
- Thomas, V. (1994) The downside of diversity. *Training & Development*, 48(1), 60-62.
- University Steering Committee. (1996). A qualitative study of the campus work climate for faculty and staff at Iowa State University.

- van Dijk, T. (1987). *Communicating racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Velasquez, M. (1998). Successful v. failed diversity programs. *The diversity training group*. Retrieved October, 13, 2000 from <http://www.diveritydtg.com>
- Villanueva, Jr., V. (1998) Scenes from and individual of color: On individuals and individualism. In M. Hecht (Ed.), *Communicating prejudice*. (pp. 235-245). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Vogel, D. & Klassen, J. (2001). Technology-supported learning: status, issues and trends. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 17, 104-114.
- West, C. & Zimmerman, D (1998). Women's place in everyday talk: Reflections on parent-child interaction. In Coates, J (Ed.), *Language and gender: A reader*. (pp. 165-175). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Whalen, T. & Wright, D. (2000). *The business case for web-based training*. Boston, MA: Artech House.
- Wheeler, M. (1994). *Diversity training*. New York, NY: The Conference Board, Inc.
- Williams, L. (2001). Coming to terms with being a young, black female academic in U.S. higher education. In R. Mabokela and A. Green (Eds.), *Sisters of the academy: Emergent black women scholars in higher education*. (pp. 93-102). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Williams, P. (1997). *Seeing a color-blind future: The paradox of race*. New York, NY: The Noonday Press.
- Wonders, N (1996). Politics of the policy process. In B. Sandler & R. Shoop (Eds.) *Sexual harassment on campus: A guide for administrators, faculty, and students*. (pp. 128-139). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Woods, R. (2001). Invisible women: The experiences of black female doctoral students at the University of Michigan. In R. Mabokela and A. Green (Eds.), *Sisters of the academy: Emergent black women scholars in higher education*. (pp. 105-115). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Yep, G. (1998). My three cultures: Navigating the multicultural identity landscape. In J. Martin, T. Nakayama & L. Flores (Eds.) *Readings in cultural contexts*. (pp. 79-85). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

- Young, D. (1995) The relationship between electronic and face-to-face communication and its implication for alternative workplace strategies. *Facilities*, 13(6), (pp. 20-27).
- Zalk, S. (1996). Men in the academy: A Psychological profile of harassers. In M. Paludi (Ed.) *Sexual harassment on college campuses: Abusing the ivory tower*. (pp. 259-278). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.